LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 1 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BJ 1201 .S8 1930 c.2
Stump, Joseph, 1866-1935.
The Christian life

copy 2

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK . BOSTON . CHICAGO . DALLAS
ATLANTA . SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON . BOMBAY . CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

A Handbook of Christian Ethics

LIBRARY OF PRINCET
APR 1 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINA

BY

JOSEPH STUMP, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D.

PRESIDENT OF NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1930

Copyright, 1930,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

All rights reserved, including the right of reproduction
in whole or in part in any form.

Set up and printed.
Published February, 1930.

SET UP BY BROWN BROTHERS LINOTYPERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE FERRIS PRINTING COMPANY

TO MY WIFE

PREFACE

THE following pages contain the substance of what for a number of years has formed the basis of the author's lectures on Christian ethics in the theological seminary in which it is his privilege to teach. This will explain the nature and form of the book. It is intended primarily as a textbook for the student and as an outline for the professor's lectures. At the same time an effort has been made to keep the discussion as free as possible from technicalities, so that the intelligent layman may read the book with interest and profit.

The book aims to set forth distinctively Christian ethics. This marks it off not only from philosophical ethics in general, but from those works which though written from the philosophic standpoint are more or less colored by Christianity and pervaded by its spirit. The author's purpose is to depict the Christian life from the standpoint of faith and regeneration; in other words, to present the moral life from the religious point of view. Such a purpose implies that the truly ethical life is grounded in the right relation of the individual to God, and that this relation determines his relation to his fellow men. The author is not unaware of the emphasis placed in these days upon the social side of ethics. But he is firmly of the conviction that the only way to Christianize society is to Christianize the individuals who compose it.

This religious purpose of the book necessarily determines its contents. Since, as is abundantly pointed out in the text, only the Christian can lead a Christian life, and his life is the fruitage of a living faith, and not simply a human endeavor to live up to a certain ideal, the study of Christian ethics involves the treatment of such subjects as sin, faith, repentance, conversion, regeneration and sanctification. This necessarily gives to certain sections of Christian ethics a doctrinal aspect which is not found in general or philosophical ethics.

The author has written from the evangelical standpoint and accepts the Holy Scriptures as the authoritative norm by which the nature of the genuinely Christian life is to be determined. Although this position is assailed, not only by writers who make no profession of Christianity, but by many who claim to be Christians, the author is convinced that the position is sound, and that evangelical Christianity alone presents the principles and alone offers the power for the leading of a truly ethical life.

The aim of the book is didactic and not controversial. It does not attempt to discuss at length any opposing theories, but leaves such discussion to the judgment of the professor in the classroom. There will doubtless be found many points which might have been treated in greater detail. But this would have increased the size of the book beyond what was deemed advisable. It is believed that the principles of Christian ethics applicable to the various conditions of human life are sufficiently stated.

We possess in the English language a wealth of treatises on philosophical ethics but comparatively few on Christian ethics. This book is sent forth with the hope that it may be helpful in making clear the nature and duties of the Christian life as a new life which is rooted in living faith in the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior.

Minneapolis, Minnesota J. S.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

Definition of Ethics in General—Personality and Morality—Religion and Morality—General and Christian Ethics—Christian Ethics and Dogmatics—Confessional Character of Christian Ethics—The Importance of Christian Ethics—The Ethics of the Greeks—Modern Philosophical Ethics—Definition and Content of Christian Ethics.

PART I

THE CHRISTIAN

CHAPTER I

MAN AS A MORAL BEING 29

Necessity of a Christian Personality—Man's Natural Constitution—Self-consciousness and Self-determination—Determinism and Indeterminism—Freedom of the Will—Accountability—Individuality.

CHAPTER II

MAN'S NATURAL MORAL STATE 41

The Moral Contradiction in Man—The Origin of Sin—The Nature of Sin—Original Sin—Actual Sins—Kinds of Sin—The Sin Against the Holy Ghost—Sins Alike in Essence—Degrees of Guilt—The Ethical Consequences of Sin—Necessity and Nature of Redemption.

CHAPTER III

THE MORAL LAW 58

The Nature of the Moral Law—The Law in Conscience—The External Human Law—The External Divine Law.

CHAPTER IV

PAGE

CONSCIENCE 62

Definition of Conscience—The Basis of Conscience in Personality—Conscience both Divine and Human—The Normative Function of Conscience—Conscience not an Infallible Guide—Hindrances to Correct Decisions—Conscience Never to Be Disobeyed—The Imperative Function of Conscience—Presupposes the Normative Function—Doubt as to What Our Duty Is—The Forensic Function of Conscience—Conscience Severe in Its Self-judgment—The Empirical Conscience—Causes of Differences in Consciences—Classification of Consciences—The Regenerate Conscience.

CHAPTER V

THE EXTERNAL POSITIVE LAW 85

Human Law—Divine Law—The Threefold Use of the Law—Nomism and Antinomianism.

CHAPTER VI

THE INNER TRANSFORMATION IN MAN 94

An Ethical Man Needed—Necessity of an Inner Transformation—The Reconciliation between God and Man—The New Attitude of God toward Man—The New Attitude of Man toward God—The Nature of the Inner Transformation—A Change of Mind—A Regeneration—A Conversion—The Transformation an Ethical One—The Power of the Divine Word—Regeneration and Sanctification.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN ETHICAL MAN 108

A New Man in Christ—The Place of Faith in the New Life—The Place of Good Works in the New Life—The Place of Sanctification in the New Life—Regeneration and Baptism—The Vital and Active Principles of the New Life—The Regenerate Man and the Law—The New Law of Freedom—The Christian's Ethical Task—The Law as a Guide—The Imitation of Christ—The Means of Grace and the Ethical Development.

PART II

THE CHRISTIAN MOTIVE

Chapter VIII

PAGE

The Nature of the Christian Life 127

A Christian Life—The Highest Good—A Radical Difference—Spiritual Growth—The Law in the Flesh—Love as the Motive—A Christlike Mind—Virtue a Unit—Faith, Hope and Love.

Chapter IX

Love to God 137

The Fundamental Virtue—A Unifying Principle—The Result of God's Love—Virtues Comprehended in Love to God—Humility—Thankfulness—Obedience—Fidelity—Trust—Joy—Hope.

Chapter X

Love to Ourselves 151

Implied in Command to Love Our Neighbor—Preservation of Fellowship with God—Virtues Needed—Wisdom—Vigilance—Courage—Temperance.

Chapter XI

Love to Our Fellow Men 155

Its Relation to Love for God—Its Scope—Its Nature—Brotherly Love—Resultant Virtues—Justice—Kindness—Long-suffering—Humility—Courtesy—Unselfishness—Chastity—Truthfulness.

Chapter XII

Love to the World in General 162

A Right Attitude Necessary—The Natural Not in Itself Sinful—The Christian in the World—But Not of It—A Free Man in Christ—Consideration for Others—Christianity Not a Religion of Gloom—Optimism and Pessimism.

PART III

CHRISTIAN CONDUCT

Chapter XIII

PAGE

General Principles of Conduct 169

The Norm of Christian Conduct—Duty and the Law—Classification of Duties—Conflict of Duties—The Doctrine of Probabilism.

Chapter XIV

The Nature of Christian Conduct 175

Two Kinds of Actions—Good Works—The Evangelical Counsels—Good Works the Fruit of Faith—Adiaphora—Christian Freedom and Christian Expediency—Pietism and Puritanism—The Vocation—The True Ideal of Christian Conduct.

Chapter XV

Duties to God 182

Prayer—Its Nature—The Essential Factor—Not a Meritorious Act—Some Practical Aspects of Prayer—The Oath—The Vow.

Chapter XVI

Duties to Ourselves 190

Spiritual Self-preservation—Care for the Body—The Soul as Mind—The Soul as Spirit—Self-denial—Temptation—The Cross—Self-development—Asceticism—Christian Meditation.

Chapter XVII

The Family 209

Its Importance—Marriage and Celibacy—Marriage—The Christian Ideal of Marriage—Care in the Choice of a Life Partner—Harmony of Beliefs and Ideals—Love Essential—Divorce—The Abuse of Sex—Husband and Wife—Parents—Children—Family Affection.

Chapter XVIII

PAGE
The Church 231

The Relation to God—Nature of the Church—The Normative Character of the Holy Scriptures—The Confessions or Creeds—The Task of the Church—The Public Service—Religious Education—Needed by the State—Missions—The Empirical Church—The Ministry—Deacons and Deaconesses—Church and State—The Individual—The Pastor—The Layman—Loyalty—A Christian Life—Stewardship—Sunday—Not the Sabbath—Proper Observance—Sunday Laws.

Chapter XIX

The State 257

Its Necessity—Its Purpose—Range of Its Activities—Justice and Order—The Laws—Punishment—Reclaiming the Criminal—Sovereignty—International Relations—War—The Christian State—The Christian as a Citizen—Officials.

Chapter XX

Society in General 270

Duties to All Mankind—Social Duties—Work—Choice of Occupation—Property—Problems—Socialism—Riches and Poverty—Right Use of Property—Honesty—Truthfulness—The Sacredness of Human Life—Friendship—Recreation and Enjoyment—Conversation—Games—Reading—Dancing—The Theatre—Mankind and the Kingdom of God.

Bibliography 291

Index 303

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

INTRODUCTION

Definition of Ethics in General. Ethics is the scientific presentation of the moral. Its subject is morality. It aims to set forth the moral ideal not simply as a matter of intellectual satisfaction or as an object of admiration, but as something which is to take concrete shape in man. On the basis of the ideal set forth, man is to seek to lead a moral life which corresponds with it.

Both in general and in Christian ethics the aim is not to set forth the actual moral attainments of man, but what ought to be attained. The ideal morality set forth by ethics is not found concretely realized in any merely human being. Whether the ideal is taken from reason, as in general ethics, or from the Scriptures, as in Christian ethics, no person can be found on earth in whom this ideal is perfectly realized. But it is set before men as an ideal which *ought* to be realized by him and by every man. Hence, the moral is to be defined, not as that which always regulates man's conduct, but as that which ought always to regulate it. It is a norm to which man does not, indeed, conform, but to which he is obligated to conform by the demand of God's will upon his will, and by the demand of his own moral nature or conscience. The real fails to measure up to the ideal, not only in the case of those who do not earnestly strive to lead a moral life, but also in the case of those who do. Even for the best of Christians the ideal remains an ideal to be striven for but never attained in this world.

The name "ethics" is derived from the Greek word *ēthos*, moral character, which in turn is derived from *ethos*, custom. In the New Testament *ethos* is found frequently, e.g., Acts 6:14; Luke 1:9; 2:42; 22:39; while *ēthos* is found but once, 1 Cor. 15:33 (translated by the A. V. "manners," and by the R. V. "morals"). In its technical sense the word was used by Aristotle (*Nichomachean Ethics*) and by the Stoics. The words "morals," "moral" and "morality" are derived from the Latin word *mos*, which originally meant "will," then "the order established by some one's will," and finally "custom."

Character and Conduct. Ethics is sometimes defined as the science of conduct. But ethics goes much deeper than that; it deals not only with conduct but with character. It deals with the moral; and the moral includes what a man ought to be as well as what he ought to do. Ethics does, indeed, treat of what a man ought to do, but it also and particularly treats of what he ought to be. This is especially true of Christian ethics; but it is really a fundamental necessity in all genuine ethics. The essential thing in morality is what a man *is.* If a man *is* what he ought to be, he will *do* what he ought to do. If he is not what he ought to be, he will not and indeed cannot do what he ought to do. If the tree is good, the fruit will be good also; and if the tree is corrupt, the fruit will be corrupt also. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit" (Matt. 7:18). "Out of the heart are the issues of life" (Prov. 4:23). "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, false witness, blasphemies" (Matt. 15:19).

In seeking to make men moral the legalist begins on the outside. He seeks to produce a good man by means of good actions for which he lays down rules and regulations. But this procedure is futile. A good man is not produced by good deeds; but on the contrary, good deeds are done by a good man. And there is only one way in which a good man can be produced, and that is by regeneration through the Gospel. The law, it is true, tells men what they ought to do, but it has no power to enable them to do it.

Hence, when God set out to reproduce in man the ethical condition lost by the fall, and to restore in him the divine moral image, He did not undertake to make man good by law. The redemption which He has prepared does not undertake to put a new patch upon an old garment. The moral condition of the race cannot be remedied by a mere reformation in conduct. God goes to the root of the trouble, and that root is the unethical state of man himself. As a consequence of original sin, man's will is by nature inclined away from God and the right. He does not love God nor seek to please Him, and thus lacks the fundamental element in the fulfillment of God's law. He suffers from the consequences of the fall. Regarded from the ethical standpoint these consequences are threefold: man no longer does God's will; he does not desire to do God's will; and he is not able to do God's will. Any plan therefore which aims at making man what he ought to be morally, must correct this threefold defect. And redemption does this. Brought to faith by God's grace, the sinner desires to do God's will, is enabled to do God's will, and does God's will.

Personality and Morality. Personality, which comprises self-consciousness and self-determination, is the condition and prerequisite of morality. Where self-consciousness and self-determination are wanting, as in the case of the brute, the question of the morality of actions cannot enter. Without self-consciousness a comparison of what we are with what we ought to be would be impossible, and all that moral activity which we call conscience would be ruled out.

Without self-determination we could not be held responsible for our acts. It is our self-determination which makes our acts our own, and hence makes us accountable for them. Morality is thus inextricably bound up with self-determination. It is found only where there is freedom of the will; and it is always found there. Free will of necessity involves morality. A free-will being is by his free will inevitably placed in the class of moral beings. On the other hand, any being that lacks free will cannot by any possibility be a moral being. Where necessity is predicated of men's actions as a result of the inner determination of their own nature or of the outer compulsion of fate there can be no such thing as morality. That which I do, not as an act of my own will, but because a natural law of my own being or some force outside of me compels me to do it, is in no sense my act as a person, and is in no sense an act for which I can be held morally responsible.

The Moral Ideal. As regards its essential character, morality is the free willing of what ought to be willed. The moral exists when *what is* corresponds with *what ought to be.* And conversely the immoral exists when what is does not correspond with what ought to be. The concrete content of what is counted as moral or immoral by men will vary, however, with the ethical ideal which they hold. What passes as perfectly moral in one place may be regarded as utterly immoral in another, because of a divergence in the ethical ideals.

The ideal varies greatly, and may be regarded under the personal or the social aspect. Among primitive heathen peoples the social ideal was found in the idea of the family or the clan; among the Greeks it was found in the State. Morality consisted in conforming to the conceptions of right relations within these spheres. For the Epicureans the personal ideal was a life which brought the largest amount of pleasure and the least amount of pain; for Aristotle it was one which avoided extremes; for the Stoics it was one led in consonance with nature. For the Utilitarian the moral is the useful; for the Altruist it is that which benefits others. For the Christian the moral consists in living in fellowship and harmony with God.

The Christian ideal is the only true one. It recognizes that the fundamental relation of life is the relation to God. It realizes that man was created in God's image, and was made for fellowship with God. If this relation within which man stood at his creation had been kept intact, all man's other relations would have remained right also. And in so far as this relation with God, which has been broken by sin, is restored by grace, all the other relations again become ethical. For the right relation with God will and necessarily must shape all the other relations of life. Love to God above all will mean that the loving of all other persons and objects will be regulated and determined by the relation which those persons and objects sustain to Him.

Religion and Morality. Religion and morality in the true sense of the terms are inseparable. Man was created both a religious and a moral being; and as in his spiritual make-up the religious and the moral elements intertwine and overlap, and cannot be separated from one another; so in the concrete realization of religion and morality they cannot be separated. So-called religions have, indeed, existed without morality; and so-called morality has existed without religion. Many men and women who make no pretense of having any religion lay claim to morality. So far as mere earthly morality is concerned, they have a right to make the claim.

But essentially religion and morality belong together. Neither can be true without the other. Religion without morality is lacking in an essential element; and morality without religion lacks the right goal and the power to reach it. Religion and morality are interdependent. Religion furnishes the basis for morality by uniting man with God in true fellowship; and morality furnishes the practical outworking of religion in the life. True ethical conduct is rooted in the communion or fellowship with God. That fellowship existed at creation and is reëstablished by redemption. Inasmuch as the breaking of that fellowship by sin destroyed in man the love to God which is the active principle of morality, the restoration of the ethical condition in man is conditioned on the reëstablishment of the fellowship with God. And while man's ethical relations include his relation to his fellow men as well as his relation to God, his relation to his fellow men can be right only when his relation to God is right.

Systems of ethics which treat of morality as independent of religion misconceive the nature both of ethics and religion. Religion is not merely the acceptance of a certain number of beliefs; nor is morality merely the doing of our duty to ourselves and our fellow men. Our ethical relations include all the persons in our environment. And by what process of reasoning can the Infinite Person be eliminated from that environment? Morality considered even from the rational standpoint, without reference to the teachings of Scripture, really demands religion; for the conscience, which no system of ethics can afford to ignore, but which necessarily forms a very central factor in every system of ethics, points to God as the one to whom man is accountable for his acts, and as the source of the moral law to which man feels himself obligated.

On the other hand religion demands morality. For fellowship with God means harmony with His will; and harmony with His will necessarily implies the endeavor to live in accordance with that will. Faith in God is not only faith in a Higher Power, but faith in a God who, judging from what we know of our own nature, has fashioned us for moral ends. Nor must it be forgotten that while morality obligates us to the right, religion alone furnishes the power to do the right. Without the power which comes from God through true religion in the soul, inner and outer conformity to God's will is impossible. "It is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13).

The view of the relation between religion and morality here presented is the view of the Christian Church. It is, indeed, true that the Roman Catholic Church misconceives both religion and morality. For it regards faith as merely intellectual assent to the teachings of the Church, and morality as obedience to the commands of the Church as well as to the law of God. It interposes itself between the soul and God, and makes man's relation to Christ dependent on his relation to the Church, instead of making his relation to the Church dependent on his relation to Christ. But it recognizes the close relation between religion and morality. The Reformation gave back to men the true conception both of religion and ethics, and emphasized the vital connection between them. It defined faith, not as assent to the Church's teaching, but as a personal trust or confidence in Christ as Savior, and as at once a receptive and an operative power—

receptive in that it apprehends Christ and His righteousness, and operative in that it worketh by love and results in a truly ethical life.

Philosophical or general ethics only too often ignores man's relation to God. But when it does so, it is defective, and overlooks what is really the principal and fundamental part of ethics. No ethics can be genuinely true and sufficiently comprehensive if it ignores our relation to the Infinite Personality in whom we live and move and have our being. An ethics which ignores this relation may result in worldly morality, humanitarianism and altruism, but cannot result in the highest form of morality.

As worldly morality places a one-sided emphasis upon our earthly relationships, so mysticism and asceticism place a one-sided emphasis upon our relation to God. Mysticism forgets or ignores the obligations of morality toward our fellow men in an attempt to be absorbed in the Deity; asceticism sets aside the human relationships and obligations, and seeks, by separation from mankind and an exclusive application of mind and heart to the direct obligation involved or supposed to be involved in the relation to God, to reach a condition of extraordinary holiness.

True ethics must give proper recognition both to our divine and our human relations. It must not cut the decalogue in half and devote its attention exclusively either to the first or the second table of the Law. It must include in its scope the whole range of life, and reach out not only horizontally to our fellow men, but also vertically to God.

General and Christian Ethics. The human race is composed of two classes of persons, the believers and the unbelievers, the regenerate and the unregenerate, the Christians and the non-Christians. This is the one fundamental distinction from the ethical standpoint. Of course, there are other distinctions when men are viewed from different standpoints, such as rich and poor, high and low, learned and ignorant, powerful and weak, honored and despised, etc. But in the eyes of God who "seeth not as man seeth," there are but the two classes—those who have profited by His grace and those who have not.

Since even those who are not Christians have a moral nature and cannot escape occupying themselves with moral questions, we have two classes of ethics—General or Philosophical Ethics, and Christian or Theological Ethics. General ethics is a treatment of moral questions from the standpoint of the natural man and in the light of the human reason alone. Christian ethics, on the other hand, is a treatment of moral questions from the standpoint of the regenerate man and in the light of the Holy Scriptures.

A study of ethical questions from the standpoint of the natural man reveals the existence of a contradiction between the demands of morality on man and his fulfillment of them. This contradiction is one which the Christian knows to be the result of the impairment of the human faculties by sin; but it is one which general ethics has been able neither to explain nor to remove. The aim of general ethics from the time of its real origin with Aristotle as a systematic science has been to reconcile the contradiction between the ideal and the real. But the endeavor has always been futile. General ethics knows of no way to enable man to meet the demands of morality. Human legislation, the impartation of knowledge, the exercise of prudence, moderation, and self-sufficiency have all been tried and have failed. General ethics has no knowledge of the highest moral goal, or of any power which will enable man to reach it. Christian ethics, on the other hand, starts with the regenerate man, in whom, by the operation of God's grace, the contradiction between the ideal and the real is removed in principle by an inward transformation, and exhibits the new moral disposition and the new moral conduct which result from the control of that principle in the heart.

Christian ethics can and should learn from general ethics. It cannot afford to ignore what general ethics has to say on such matters as the natural moral consciousness, the principles of morality, the norm, the motive, and the goal of ethics, and the manifestations of the moral element in man's disposition and conduct. The modern development of psychology both from the metaphysical and the empirical standpoint must be taken into account. At the same time care must be taken not only to deny all claims to superiority on the part of general ethics, but also to avoid transplanting from general ethics into Christian ethics ideas which are in essential conflict with the basic principles of the latter.

The Ancient Church had a high regard for the ethics of antiquity. In setting forth Christian morality, its aim largely was to present it as a supplement and completion of the ethics of the Greeks and Romans. In the Middle Ages faith, hope, and love were added to the four cardinal virtues of the Greeks. Such a view was, of course, defective. While there is, indeed, much that is commendable in the ethics of those ancient peoples, it was a mistake to regard it as a structure perfect as far as it went and only needing to be completed by the addition of certain moral teachings of Christianity. With all the excellencies of the Greek ethics, it labored under several fundamental defects. It found its goal in man instead of in God; its ideal was imperfect; and it possessed no knowledge of any power by which man might be enabled to realize the ethical ideal.

The Roman Catholic Church holds that man by nature possesses all the powers necessary to do God's will, and that these powers need only to be stirred up by the Holy Spirit in order to enable man not only to do all that God demands, but also to perform works of supererogation which may be applied to the credit of other persons. The Reformers, on the other hand, denied the possession by the natural man of the powers necessary to the leading of a truly ethical life, and insisted that these powers are bestowed by God's grace in regeneration. They distinguished between the natural man's power to do good within the realm of the *justitia civilis*, and the regenerate man's power to do good within the realm of the *justitia spiritualis*. Protestantism rejects the notion that Christian ethics is merely a supplement to natural ethics, and maintains that Christian ethics alone furnishes the true ethical goal. In the Lutheran Church the distinction between General and Christian ethics was first clearly drawn by Calixtus, who emphasized the regenerate man as the subject of Christian ethics.

Christian Ethics and Dogmatics. Christian ethics is really a part of dogmatics. It deals with the regenerate man and the new life which he leads as a new man in Christ. No treatment of dogmatics can be complete without including a treatment of faith, not only as a receptive, but also as an operative power in the heart and life of the Christian. Regeneration and sanctification and the relation between faith and good works are an integral part of every system of dogmatics. But at the same time the subject of the regenerate man is capable and worthy of such large elaboration that it deserves separate and independent treatment as the science of Christian or theological ethics. It cannot be treated in its proper place in dogmatics with the fullness with which it ought to be treated without enlarging that part of dogmatics which refers to regeneration and sanctification to such dimensions as to make it utterly disproportionate to the space given to other topics in the system.

While, therefore, Christian ethics may be formally distinguished from dogmatics in various ways, it forms in reality a part of the system of doctrine as a whole—but a part taken out and treated in greater detail and with a large degree of independence.

Some of the distinctions which in a formal way may be drawn between Christian ethics and dogmatics are the following: Dogmatics is the science of the Christian faith; ethics is the science of the Christian life. Dogmatics treats of the objective facts and truths of the Christian religion; ethics treats of the subjective state and conduct of the Christian. Dogmatics says, "God has first loved us"; ethics says "Let us love God." Faith is the common bond uniting them; for faith as a receptive power appropriates the grace of God in Christ and thus justifies; while faith as an operative power and as the principle of the new life implanted by grace results in a new and right disposition toward God and the good, and brings forth fruit in holy living. The faith which justifies is at the same time a faith which worketh by love; and it is this working of faith by love which Christian ethics aims to set forth.

In reality, therefore, dogmatics and ethics treat of the same topic, but from a different viewpoint. Dogmatics treats of the fellowship with God considered from the divine side, and shows what God has done and does to establish and maintain that fellowship; ethics treats of that fellowship from the human side, and shows the nature of the life which results when that fellowship has been established through faith. Thus dogmatics treats of the truths and principles of the true religion, while ethics treats of the morality which characterizes the true religion. Dogmatics emphasizes man's religious dependence on God; ethics emphasizes his duty to God. True dogmatics must be ethical, and true ethics must be dogmatical. The true doctrine cannot be separated from the Christian life in which it results; and the true life cannot be separated from the faith from which it springs.

The two branches overlap and interlace at many points. Many of the topics which appear in dogmatics reappear in ethics, to be regarded and treated there from a different standpoint. Thus the Law, Sin, the Work of Christ, Regeneration, Sanctification, the Church, etc., are treated in dogmatics from the viewpoint of what God has done and does for us; while in ethics they are treated from the viewpoint of what we as Christians are to do for God.

Because of this essential unity of dogmatics and ethics they were originally treated as one branch of Christian theology. They are still treated as one science by some modern theologians, e.g., Sartorius: *The Doctrine of Divine Love.*

Confessional Character of Christian Ethics. Owing to the fundamental character of faith both in dogmatics and ethics, the different dogmatic conceptions of the various Churches have a powerful influence upon their ethics. Consequently ethics has a confessional character. The Roman Catholic Church on the one hand and the Reformed and Lutheran Churches on the other are quite as clearly distinguished from each other in their ethics as in their dogmatics.

The Roman Catholic Church regards faith as assent to the teaching of the Church, and knows nothing of faith as an operative power or as the vital principle in the new Christian life. It bases its ethics on its doctrine of the Church, which is, that the external Roman Church is identical with the kingdom of God; and it makes Christian morality consist essentially in obedience to the Church. Its ethics has a legalistic character, and it regards the Gospel largely as a new law. It finds the power of the new life, not in the grace of God which implants and sustains faith, but in the effort of the human will; and this effort has a meritorious character; good works have a share in achieving salvation. Its ethics is atomistic, consisting of obedience to a multitude of rules for the regulation of conduct. It is dualistic, in that it distinguishes between a lower order of morality, which obeys God's precepts and the commands of the Church, and a higher order of morality, which obeys also the evangelical counsels.

In contrast with this ethical teaching of Rome, both Lutheran and Reformed ethics insist upon the close connection between faith and the Christian life, and regard the ethical life as a unity, with faith as the new life-principle, and love as its manifestation.

While, however, Lutheran and Reformed ethics agree in the main, they have points of difference. Since the believer's will has been brought into harmony with God's will, and he desires to do the very things which God wills he should do, Lutheran ethics finds in faith the sufficient principle and guaranty of the ethical life. Reformed ethics, on the other hand, lays much emphasis on the use of the law as a disciplinary power, and is more legalistic than the Lutheran. This legalistic tendency is apparent, e.g., in its doctrine of the Sabbath, and in the fact that the Reformed Church often (e.g., under Calvin in Geneva) approaches closely to the theocratic standpoint of the Old Testament.

The Importance of Christian Ethics. The importance of the study of Christian ethics is apparent from a number of considerations. First, the human mind is so constituted that in all departments of knowledge it seeks not only to apprehend facts but to systematize them and to exhibit their inner relations; and accordingly the Christian mind demands an accurate and scientific knowledge of a matter so vital as the new divine life in man. Again, the Christian Church, whose duty it is to inculcate Christian morality, must know the nature of the ethical life which she is to set forth before her members as the Christian ideal. Furthermore, the times in which we live present many difficult and complex problems, to the solution of which Christians must address themselves, and for which they alone possess in Christian ethics the correct and adequate principles. And finally, Christian ethics possesses a large apologetic value, in that the divine origin of Christianity is shown, on the one hand, by the exalted character of its ethical teachings, which not only could not have originated in the sinful heart of man, but which are frequently antagonistic to the natural bent of the human heart; and on the other hand, by the high ethical character of the lives of believers under the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit. There is, indeed, much immorality even in Christian lands, and much failure on the part of Christians to attain the ideal Christian life. But Christianity must be judged, not by the half-hearted efforts of its nominal adherents, but by the lives of genuine Christians, and by the ideals which the Christian religion sets before men.

The Ethics of the Greeks. Ethics in the proper sense of the term begins with the Golden Age of Greek philosophy.

With all its estimable qualities, the Greek ethics had many defects. It did not start with the idea of an infinite God; it had no proper conception of the goal of ethics; and it had no right conception of moral freedom, predicating it only of a favored class or nation, and denying it to slaves and barbarians.

Socrates' famous maxim was "Know thyself." For him the knowledge of the good was the chief end of philosophy. The good was identified with knowledge. According to him, there is only one virtue; namely, knowledge or wisdom; all other virtues are different forms of this one. It was inconceivable to him that men should know the good and not do it: give men a knowledge of the good, and they will act virtuously. Evil is the result of ignorance. The philosopher alone can be truly virtuous, because he alone possesses sufficient knowledge. The wise man is happy. Knowledge, virtue and happiness are different phases of the same thing.

Plato regarded morality as God-likeness. The world, which is the best possible expression of the divine idea, is a thing of beauty. Hence the highest aim of man is to realize the beautiful, the ideal, the godlike. The world does not yield perfectly to God's idea, because there is in matter an irrational resistance which results in imperfect conformity to the idea and in physical and moral evil. This is evidenced in man by the antagonism between reason and the lower animal desires. Plato has no conception of evil as inherent in the human will. Virtue is acquired through knowledge. The knowledge of the good is necessarily followed by the practice of the good. Evil is the result of ignorance, and is unintentional. Virtue is essentially a unity, but appears in four forms: Wisdom, Courage, Temperance and Justice. The essence of virtue is love to God; that is, not love for God Himself, but love for the concrete manifestation of God's idea in the world. The beautiful is a revelation of the divine; it is the only form in which the divine is accessible to us.

The ethical ideal is realized only in the ideal State. It is the task of the State to make its citizens ideally good. Corresponding to the three parts of the soul, which are: reason, which resides in the head, courage, which resides in the heart, and the desires, which reside in the lower part of the body, the State should have three classes of citizens: namely, 1. philosophers, who are to rule, 2. warriors, who are to protect the State externally, and 3. producers, who are to be excluded from political affairs and confined to the acquisition of money. The first class is to be especially marked by wisdom, the second by courage, and the third by temperance or modesty. Justice is to be the regulative virtue which keeps the three classes in equilibrium, and holds them to their proper tasks. The existence of slavery is taken for granted. The citizen's rights consist only of those granted to him by the State. He ceases to have the right of existence as soon as he ceases to be useful to the State. The incurably sick are to be left to die; defective children are to be exposed. Children are to be begotten solely in the interests of the State. In the case of the first two classes of citizens the rulers are to bring together the most suitable pairs for the propagation of the finest children. There is to be no permanent marriage relation; wives are to be held in common or exchanged. Men from thirty to fifty-five years of age are obligated to beget children; women from twenty to forty are obligated to bear children. After that age the men and women may mate as they please, but must not produce children. All children are to be the property of the State; their fatherhood will be unknown, and they are to be nursed by the women interchangeably. Women are to do the same work as men, and even to become soldiers, serving in the rear ranks.

Aristotle was the first to present ethics as a scientific system, distinguishing it from physics on the one hand, and politics on the other. He grounds the moral idea in the rational self-consciousness. The world is the best possible one, and a perfect expression of the will of the rational spirit. He rejects Plato's notion that an evil pervades all physical existence, especially humanity, and that the body is the prison of the soul. The populace has no inner tendency toward the good, but the more gifted free-born man is by nature good, and possesses in his own reason the pure fountain of moral knowledge. The goal of morality is the well-being of the moral subject. Virtue includes in itself the feeling of happiness, and consists in the constant observance of the proper mean between two unvirtues. It is choosing the medium way, hence moderation, as determined by public opinion, and especially as embodied in legal enactments. The presupposition of all moral activity is the perfect freedom of the will.

Virtue is either *thought-virtue*, referring to the proper condition of reason itself, or it is *ethical virtue*, consisting in the subordination of the sensuous nature to reason. The former is largely identical with wisdom in the Platonic sense; the latter includes courage, temperateness, liberality, magnanimity, self-control, and the social virtues of amiability, truthfulness, good-natured wit, shame, justice (including fairness and equity).

The highest goal, well-being, is regarded simply from the individual and subjective standpoint; the idea of humanity as a moral whole is wanting. Friendship is a form of the manifestation of virtue in general, and includes love; but this love is not identical with Christian love, and has only subjective significance. It exists not for the sake of the loved one, but for the sake of the one who loves. The duty of love to all men is foreign to Aristotle as to the whole Greek world. Love (friendship) is manifested only toward one or more chosen ones. Wedlock is the most natural of all friendships.

The State is the necessary condition for the general realization of morality, inasmuch as the mere teaching of virtue is not sufficient for the multitude, and they must be guided and trained to virtue by the rationally governed State. He declares that the great multitude obeys force rather than reason, and punishment rather than morality. He has no hope of radically improving the unreceptive multitude, but simply of holding it in check by custom or by force through the State. He regards the being truly free in moral respects as the exclusive privilege of the few who are naturally gifted with moral discernment. He has no confidence in any ethical theory or system founded on the broad basis of the morality of the multitude, but asks for the sovereignty of the spiritual and moral heroes. He does not realize the ethical defectiveness of human nature which is found even in sages and philosophers, nor divine any remedy for it.

Epicureanism regards pleasure as the highest good, and virtue as only the means to that end. To strive after pleasure is the highest wisdom and morality. Pleasure, however, though desirable, is not to be chosen if it will lead to greater pain. It is not the momentary pleasure which we are to follow (the view of the Cyrenaics) but pleasure in the larger sense, including the pleasures of the mind. The highest good is a happy life, which includes a healthy body and a tranquil mind. The cardinal virtue is prudence—the insight necessary so to regulate the desires that there is a preponderance of pleasure over pain. Fear of the gods and fear of death are superstitions, because the gods have nothing to do with this world. Human responsibility for wrongdoing was thus reduced to a minimum. Epicureanism found a wide acceptance, and its results were thoroughly bad. The moral corruption of ancient Greece and Rome may, in part at least, be traced to this system of ethics. The teachings of Epicurus became very popular in the time of the English Deists and the French Encyclopedists. They are to-day practically the ethics of the worldly.

Stoicism maintained that man must live "in consonance with nature." The highest good is virtue, not pleasure. Man is a self-poised, absolutely free and self-determining being, and should not permit himself to be determined by anything external to himself. Thinking, not feeling, is the criterion of the true and the good. To live right means to live according to reason. Evil is anti-natural and anti-rational. Virtue is to be sought for its own sake, without reference to the feeling of happiness. Happiness is the result but not the end of moral action. The perfection and happiness of the sage depend entirely on himself; he is not affected or disturbed by anything that is not dependent upon himself. Stoicism rests on pride of the subjective understanding and the self-regulating will of man, and leads to a despising of reality. It maintains that the sage ought to help the wretched, but not to feel compassion; for he is above all suffering. His patience and resignation spring from contemptuous pride. It is "a passive resistance against an irrational reality." Death must not be feared but despised, and as a deliverance from bodily pain is to be welcomed. Immortality is a mere possibility. If it exists, the wise man will be happy; if it does not exist, there will be an end to all his pain. Suicide is under certain circumstances a duty and a heroic virtue. The wise man lives only as long as life pleases him.

While Epicureanism and Stoicism seem diametrically opposed to one another, they have this in common that both find the ground of moral right in the individual acting subject of ethics, and both seek inner tranquillity as the moral goal. For the Epicurean existence has value only in so far as it can be enjoyed; for the Stoic moral order is found only in the sage, and apart from him it exists only imperfectly.

Greek ethics presents no higher ideal than the saying of Plato that virtue consists in resemblance to God. While in form this teaching approaches that of Christianity, in content it is different. For him likeness to God meant essentially love for the beautiful. The ethics of the Greek philosophers represents the highest point attained by the unaided intellect, but it falls far short of the truth as it is in Christ. There was no true sense of sin or of the defect of human nature, nor any consciousness of the need of a spiritual redemption and regeneration.

Modern Philosophical Ethics. In seeking to give a brief survey of modern philosophical ethics, one of the difficulties encountered is that of the classification of the various authors and their theories. Each writer who classifies them has virtually a classification of his own.

In a general way it is possible, with Professor Seth in his *Ethical Principles*, to divide ethical theories into the ethics of sensibility, the ethics of reason, and the ethics of will or personality. Under the first class would fall every kind of hedonism, beginning with the Cyrenaics of antiquity who made momentary pleasure and the Epicureans who made the total life pleasure the goal of ethics, and running down to the various hedonistic theories of modern times.

Utilitarianism finds the goal of ethics in the happiness of the greatest number. In elaborating this theory Bentham undertook to compute the quantity of the pleasure and thus in a sense to reduce ethical conduct to a matter of mathematics. Spencer endeavors to fit the utilitarian theory into his theory of evolution, and finds the goal of ethics in pleasure; while Stephen finds it in the health or efficiency of the social tissue; and S. Alexander finds it in equilibrium. Sidgwick's theory is a modified hedonism in which pleasure supplies the end while prudence, benevolence and justice stand forth as the chief virtues. In its newest form utilitarianism aims to secure the maximum of attainable happiness for mankind by basing its theory of right and wrong upon observation of the social results of conduct.

That a hedonistic basis of ethics is an unsound one appears from the fact that duty and pleasure do not always correspond. Pleasure cannot be the end of right action, though it may be and frequently is and ought to be the accompaniment of right action. There is a vast difference between the pursuit of pleasure as an ethical aim and the enjoyment of the pleasure which accompanies the pursuit of the right aim. Pleasure and the good are not identical. The good is what ought to please; but does it always do so? And is it not a fact that the pursuit of pleasure as an end often leads men into wrongdoing?

The ethics of reason represents an advance upon hedonism.

It introduces the distinction between pleasure and duty, prudence and virtue, expediency and the right. In part, this distinction is recognized in the transition from pure hedonism to utilitarianism. Thus Bentham modifies the pursuit of pleasure by quantitive measurement; while Sidgwick leads from egoism to altruism. Paley maintains that happiness is the result of seeking the happiness of others.

The extreme ethics of rationalism is found in the Cynics of antiquity, who advocated the passionless life of reason, indifference to pleasure and pain, and the reduction of wants to a minimum; and to a lesser degree in the Stoics, who advocated the life of pure reason, left no place for natural sensibility, and from a pantheistic basis regarded everything that happened as best for the universe as a whole. A counterpart of this extreme rationalism of antiquity is found in the Christian asceticism which declared the body and its natural desires to be evil, and in Kant's rational asceticism which maintained that the only good in the world is the good will, that morality is obedience to the universal reason, that the human will is autonomous, and that the command of conscience is a categorical imperative. The weakness in this rationalistic ethics lies in the fact that to ignore the sensibility entirely is to remain without motive, just as ignoring reason leads to egotism.

The moderate rationalism or intuitionism holds that "moral judgments are reducible to certain self-evident principles or maxims." Philosophical intuitionism was a protest against Hobbes' exaltation of selfishness. Hobbes declared that the natural state is one of war, with each for himself; and he explained the origin of society and the State as a social compact to guard against the natural anarchy. Against Hobbes, Cumberland maintained that the supreme law of nature is benevolence, and that the goal is the good of all; while S. Clarke added equity to benevolence.

Dogmatic intuitionism or the Scottish Ethics of Common Sense originated in opposition to Hume, and placed its emphasis upon conscience, which it defined as the "moral common sense"—the common apprehension of self-evident moral principles which do not need to be demonstrated. The strength of this theory lies in the stress which it lays upon the existence of an immutable element in morality and upon the reality of a moral ideal.

Hedonism is weak because of the unsafeness of feeling as a regulative ethical principle. Ethical rationalism has rendered a service in exposing this weakness, in bringing into the foreground the dignity of man as a rational being, in emphasizing the "ought," and in fostering an idealistic view of morality. Its own weakness lies in its exclusion of the feelings as a motive.

Eudæmonism or the ethics of will or personality endeavors to present ethics from the standpoint of the moral development of the total self. Its watchword is self-realization. "The will is the total self in action." Eudæmonism seeks to take account of the opposing ethical principles of feeling and of reason, and to bring them into harmony and unity in the will. Hegel's principle was, "Be a person and respect others as persons." Green sets forth clearly the reconciliation of feeling and reason. Complete eudæmonism is the doctrine that the good is found in the complete rationalization of desire.

Christianity does justice both to sensibility and to reason, but brings them into subjection to the regenerated and renewed will. It finds place for a proper desire for happiness; but sanctified reason finds that happiness in the pursuit of the good, and the good in the life lived in fellowship with God through Christ. Not happiness itself, but life in fellowship and harmony with God is the Christian's goal. But the highest and truest happiness accompanies the pursuit of that goal—a partial and alloyed happiness here on earth in accordance with the partial attainment of the goal, and a perfect happiness, a blessedness, in the next world when perfect fellowship with God is attained.

Definition and Content of Christian Ethics. Christian or Theological Ethics is the science which treats of the new life of the Christian or regenerate man. In the presentation of this subject we shall consider: 1. The Christian as a product of divine grace, 2. The motive which actuates him, and 3. The conduct to which this motive impels him. The acting subject of Christian ethics is, therefore, not the natural man, but the Christian or regenerate man. The norm of Christian ethics is the nature and will of God. And the source of Christian ethics is the revelation of the nature and will of God as recorded in the Holy Scriptures.

The following are some of the definitions given by authors of various treatises on the subject. Wuttke: Christian ethics is the science of Christian morals. Martensen: Christian ethics is the science of morals conditioned by Christianity. Schmid: Christian ethics is a systematic representation of moral life under the influence of personal Christian faith. Vilmar: Christian ethics is the doctrine of man in relation to the redeeming activity of God. Harless: Christian ethics is the history of the development of man redeemed by God. Frank: Christian ethics deals with the Christian's free growth or development (*das freie Werden*) as conditioned by Christian faith. Dorner: Christian ethics is the science of that which is absolutely worthy—of that which, as to form, is worked out through continual personal self-determination; but, as to substance, is to be described as the appropriation, by means of the divine pneuma, of the natural personality and, with it, of the first creation. Koestlin: Christian ethics presents the moral life as a life lived on the basis of redemption and in the state of redemption. Haering: Christian ethics shows how the faith which is certain of salvation works in love to God and man. Luthardt: Christian ethics is the scientific presentation of Christian morality in its personal origin, its reality as a disposition, and its actual exhibition in conduct. Keyser: Christian ethics is the science of right and wrong in principle, character and conduct. Smyth: Christian ethics is the science of living according to Christianity. Luther's idea of the contents of Christian ethics may be summarized under three heads: 1. The person of the Christian (The freedom of the believer), 2. The mind of the Christian (Love proceeding from faith), 3. The works of the Christian (The serving activity of love).

PART I

THE CHRISTIAN

CHAPTER I

MAN AS A MORAL BEING

Necessity of a Christian Personality. Christian ethics demands as a fundamental prerequisite the existence of a Christian personality. Just as there can be no ethical life of any kind without an ethical subject, so there can be no Christian ethical life without a Christian ethical subject. Before a man can live a life in communion with God, he must first have been reinstated in communion with Him through faith in Christ. In other words, he must first have become a Christian before he can lead a Christian life.

In undertaking to consider the Christian, or regenerate man, as the first part of Christian ethics, we must remember that man as he is by nature is not regenerate, and that he becomes so only through the work of the Holy Spirit in his heart. Since, then, he is a man before he is a Christian, it will be necessary first to view him in his natural state, and then to trace the process by which he becomes a regenerate or new man in Christ Jesus.

Man's Natural Constitution. Let us ask then, what kind of a being is man by nature? To this we reply, that his distinctive characteristic is that he is a Moral Being. He stands alone among all the creatures of the earth as a being endowed with a moral nature and capable of communion with God.

In his nature man is composite, and consists of both a material and a spiritual part. He has a body and a soul. But while he is thus composite, he is a unit. Body and soul are so intimately united that they form one being. No one understands or can explain this intimate union of soul and body. No one can tell just how the soul dwells in the body or where; how the impressions of sense are communicated from the brain to the mind, or how the mind controls and directs the various parts of the body. There is a duality, and also a unity. We are conscious that we are made up of two factors, and yet we are conscious that in the true sense of the term we are one.

On the material side man is allied to nature. He is a part of nature inasmuch as he is a created and finite being who is in nature and a part of it, and who finds the theater of his activities within the sensible order of things. As a part of nature he is subject to its physical and psychological laws. He lives and moves and acts in the realm of nature. As regards his body he is made of the dust of the ground like the brute creation, and like it is subject to the processes of growth, development, decay and death. The Scriptural account of man's creation tells us that "the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. And man became a living soul." Hence the soul of man is not merely the life of the body as in the case of the brute, nor the acme of physical evolutionary development. There is an antithesis between soul or spirit, and body; yet the two form a unity in the person, so that the soul is the life of the body. This composite unity of man, in which the body is the tabernacle and organism of the soul, and the soul is the life of the body, constitutes man a two-sided being. On the one side he is a part of nature;

on the other side, as a personality, he is independent of nature.

Man is also allied to God. This is his distinctive honor and glory. The Bible tells us that God made man in His own image, after His own likeness. What does this mean? In what respect is man God's image? Certainly he is not God's image so far as his body is concerned; for God is a pure Spirit and has no body. It is not the bodily but the spiritual side of man to which the image of God must be referred. God made man's spirit an image of His own.

Of all the earthly creatures man alone is made in God's image. This image of God, therefore, must be that which fundamentally distinguishes man from the brute creation. The difference between them cannot be ignored or obliterated, nor can the barrier between the spiritual and the physical be broken down. An impassable chasm separates man from the brute; the difference between them is not merely one of degree, but of kind. And what is it that marks man off from the brute as a being of a different order entirely? It is the fact that man is a person. The brute is not a person. No matter what intelligence any man may ascribe to the dog and the horse, he would not call them persons. And it is this element of personality which in the metaphysical sense constitutes man the image of God. God is a person, the infinite, absolute Person; and He made man to be on a finite scale what He Himself is on an infinite scale. As the tiny circle is an image or likeness of the large circle, so man the finite person is an image of God the infinite person.

Self-consciousness and Self-determination. What are the distinguishing marks or characteristics of personality? It is often declared that a person is one who can say "I." But this description of a person does not point out with sufficient detail what constitutes personality. It would be better to say that a person is a being who can say "I will." For there are two fundamental factors that constitute personality; namely, self-consciousness and self-determination. As a being who is self-conscious and distinguishes himself from his environment and makes himself an object of his own thought, man says "I." As a being who is self-determining, who wills what he does, and thus determines his own actions, man says "I will."

The brute is conscious but not self-conscious. That he possesses in varying degree a certain amount of brute intelligence is undoubtedly true. And that we are sometimes greatly surprised at the extraordinary intelligence exhibited by dogs, elephants and other animals is beyond dispute. But there is no evidence that the brute ever makes himself the object of his own reflection, analyzes his own thoughts and feelings, or possesses any consciousness of an ego. Man, however, is a self-conscious being. He is an ego of whose identity and unity he is immediately conscious. Whatever be the changes and vicissitudes he undergoes in body or mind, the consciousness of the identity of self abides. As far back as he can remember it is always the same self that thinks, feels and acts. He says, *I* did these and those things; *I* experienced this and that.

Again, the brute has no self-determination. It is true, he manifests preferences. These, however, are not the result of free choice but of necessity. He does not determine himself, but is determined by his own nature. His actions are the result, so to say, of a push from behind, the urge of his own instincts and impulses. He does not and cannot make a rational and free choice of his course of action. But man is endowed with a free will. This will, as we shall see later, has its limitations, and in the sphere of the divine has lost its freedom. But in the realm of the earthly and temporal this will is free. Man can do what he will within the limits of his power and ability. He chooses freely what he will do. This choice is not always consciously exercised. Many acts are performed from habit; but they are the result of decisions of the will made long since; and they are therefore none the less free-will acts. Man is not determined in his actions by any force from without (fatalism), nor by any constraint of his nature from within (determinism, necessitarianism), but freely determines himself. It is this self-determination which most decidedly marks man as a personal being. It is in his acts of the will that man becomes most clear in his self-consciousness, because he recognizes himself as a cause. "The will is the man in action." "The will is the man." As a part of nature, man like the rest of the world is under necessary law; but as a person, with power of choice, he is not subject to the "must" of the natural laws but to the "ought" of the moral law.

This personality or ego of man is not identical with the soul's activity, but is a certain background which is the subject of that activity, and which retains its identity amid all the changes in the body and all the varying activities and experiences of the mind. It stands outside of the bounds of necessity or compulsion, whether of nature or of its own physical and psychical life. Motives present themselves to it, not as coercive forces, but as offering alternatives from which the person may choose. The physical and mental endowments of man are the means to an end; but the person himself, conditioned by his dependence on God, chooses the end, and employs the natural endowments as the means.

Determinism and Indeterminism. Too great an emphasis upon man as a part of nature results in determinism; while too great an emphasis upon the personality, without proper regard for the nature-side of man, results in indeterminism. Determinism regards man simply as a part of nature and as subject to its laws of necessity. It takes away man's freedom of action and supplants the ethical activity with one which is conditioned by the law inhering in the totality of things, and which consequently ceases to be ethical. According to this theory man does not determine himself, but is determined by causes lying outside of the ego, either in the world (naturalism, fatalism, pantheism, materialism) or in God (predestination). The theory maintains that the motive is an irresistible motor, and is a cause which, like a physical force, always produces a certain effect. But determinism conflicts with the fundamental facts of moral experience; for when man looks back upon his actions, he is constrained to admit that he might have done otherwise.

The name indeterminism is used in two senses. In the one sense it means that the ego determines itself in an absolutely arbitrary way, irrespective of motives, habits, character and the like. In the other sense it means that the ego possesses both formal and material freedom, and is able of itself to do the truly good (Pelagianism).

Freedom of the Will. Freedom of choice on man's part is executed on the basis of motives and is grounded in the psychic state. But the decision is not always made on the basis of a proper evaluation of the motives nor in obedience to the existing psychic condition, as e.g., in the control of the psychic state of anger. The act of the will is an inner inscrutable act of the ego, by which it determines its own attitude toward the ethical possibilities of the situation as presented by the motives and the antecedent history of the person. Each act of the will is related to previous acts and is a continuation of them, but is at the same time a new act. It may take place in accordance with the inclination of the subject or in opposition to it.

This freedom, which may be called the formal freedom of men, is one which belongs to all men within the realm of purely earthly morality. It is the *libertas in justitia civile.* But the higher or material freedom belongs only to the regenerate man, and consists in the agreement of the human will with the divine. This is the true and highest freedom; for the end or goal of man is found in God. "The service of God is true freedom."

Because of the freedom of the will which marks man as a person, he is a moral being, responsible for his acts. It is difficult to see how on any theory of determinism, philosophical or theological, man can be held accountable for what he does. If what he does is not done by his free will, but is a necessary result of forces over which he has no control, the act is not really his, and he can neither be justly blamed nor praised for it. If he acts like the brute from necessity, then like the brute he can neither be rewarded nor punished in any true sense of the terms. He is then an unmoral being.

Free will is not disproved by the fact that the actions of men under given circumstances may often be foretold with considerable certainty. They cannot be foretold with absolute certainty; for the man who for a long time has acted in a certain way, and of whom it is supposed that he will continue to act in that way, may suddenly act differently.

Accountability. Having a free will, man is in reality the author of his own acts. By his acts of free will he brings into existence a good or an evil which had no existence before, and for whose existence he is responsible. This is true even when that which was willed remained in the mind and did not become actualized in the external world. Man is, therefore, a moral being accountable to his own better self and to God for all that he does. He cannot escape responsibility. Freedom and responsibility go together. God has given to man a relative independence of action. Within the limits which God has set, man is his own master and can do what he will. This is attested by man's own consciousness. For whatever he may have done, good or bad, he has the consciousness that he might have done otherwise had he chosen so to do. The poignancy of regret and the self-accusation of repentance are due to this consciousness that the act was one which he might have avoided if he would. This freedom is bound up in the personality of man. Were it taken away, he would cease to be a man and become a mere brute or machine. Having made man a person, God respects the freedom which he has given him, and, within the limits set by His providence, permits man its full exercise. So much does God respect the freedom which he has given to men that he permits them, if they choose so to do, to transgress all the divine laws and to trample the divine love under foot. He cannot take away their freedom unless He would take away their humanity with it.

But while God respects man's freedom, He emphasizes man's accountability. This accountability is inseparable from freedom. And the consciousness that he is accountable for the good or the bad which he does is woven into the very fabric of man's being. His conscience urges him to do the right and bids him expect the condemnation of self and the retribution of a Higher Being if he does wrong. And what conscience emphasizes is enforced by Scripture; for "every one of us shall give an account of himself to God" (Rom. 14:12).

Individuality. While every man is a moral being by nature, it does not follow that he is exactly like every other man. He is like all others in that, like them, he possesses the common elements of humanity; but he is unlike all others in that he possesses those elements in a different combination. It would be impossible to discover two human beings exactly alike in every respect. Even twins, who often resemble one another very closely, present differences, physically and mentally. Every man is a distinct individual. He comes into the world with a combination of aptitudes, capacities, impulses, inclinations and possibilities of physical and mental development which is peculiarly his own. In this respect nature fixes for every man certain bounds beyond which he cannot go. Each has his limitations. Impulses and inclinations may be encouraged or restrained, aptitudes and capacities may be neglected or developed; but no one can add a cubit to his stature or increase the measure of his natural endowments. All this means that for every man the development of his "self" as a moral being is a problem which, though like, is yet unlike the problem of every other man, and demands individual attention for its solution. The goal of morality is the establishment of the right moral relation between each person and God. It is evident therefore that the establishment of this right relation involves in every individual case peculiar factors of its own.

The individuality of men is due to various causes. Heredity, environment, race, nationality, sex and temperament are the principal factors to which the individuality of men is to be traced. It is easy to lay too much or too little stress upon any one of these factors, and the exact degree in which they enter into the individual human equation is hard to determine.

Heredity undoubtedly is a fundamental factor in man's individuality. He *is* because of his ancestors, and he is *what he is* because of them. From them he inherits his body and mind. The traits, aptitudes and powers of the parents reappear in the children, though not in equal measure in each child. And it is apparent that heredity reaches far back behind the immediate ancestors to those who are more or less remote. Traits which have not appeared for several generations reappear in some distant descendent.

Environment is a powerful factor, not in the sense that it adds anything to man's endowment, but that it modifies the development of the capacities, powers, traits, etc., whose sum total makes up the individual. The atmosphere in which we live, the surroundings of our daily lives, the influence of our associates, the intellectual, moral and religious standards of the family, the spirit of the age—all these things have a greater or lesser effect upon the individuality.

Race is not only a factor in determining color, but in determining many physical and mental characteristics. It marks a clear line of cleavage among the inhabitants of the earth, and so influences the individuality of men, that intermarriage of the races is rare, and is regarded with disfavor.

Nationality, while not determining individuality so markedly as race, and offering no serious impediment to intermarriage, nevertheless does have a decided influence in shaping the individual. The spirit, customs, educational and moral standards, business ethics, industrial status and many other peculiarities of a nation so fashion the individual, that we can often without difficulty single out the nationality of men because of our familiarity with certain national characteristics.

The influence of sex upon the individual, apart from the specific function of the propagation of the race, is one which has often been overestimated. That woman has been frequently considered a being inferior to man is a commonplace of history. The modern emancipation of woman and the opening up of the door of opportunity for equal education and employment have forced a modification of view. It is evident that there is much less difference in the traits and capacities of men and women than was supposed. At the same time, however, it still remains true that sex is not a negligible factor in the determination of individuality. In a general way the male sex is marked by the predominance of intellect and will, initiative and activity, while the female sex is marked by greater passivity and receptivity, and a predominance of intuition and feeling. Yet there are many exceptions to the rule.

Temperament plays a large part in the determination of the individuality. An old but still useful classification of the temperaments divides them into the sanguine, the melancholic, the choleric, and the phlegmatic. These are seldom found pure in any individual. Usually a man's temperament contains a combination of two or more of these four fundamental classes. In general the sanguine temperament is that which marks childhood, the melancholic that which marks youth, the choleric that which marks middle age, and the phlegmatic that which marks old age. The sanguine temperament is optimistic, susceptible, and easily stirred, but not profoundly; it is apt to be superficial and changeable. The melancholic is characterized by imagination and sentiment. It is idealistic, but is in danger of becoming selfcentered and pessimistic. The choleric is the temperament of practical activity and mastery, but is in danger of becoming stubborn and cruel and of yielding to the lust for power. The phlegmatic is the quiet and contemplative temperament, not easily excited or roused to activity; it is in danger of running into insensibility, indifference and sloth. In the course of his lifetime a man is likely to manifest varying degrees of one or the other of these temperaments.

Viewing man, then, in his natural state we find that he is a moral being; that he is on the one hand allied to nature and is a part of it; but that on the other hand he is a person and is above nature, being made in the image of God. As a person he is self-conscious and self-determining. Possessed of free will in earthly and temporal matters, he is the author of his own acts and morally responsible for them. He is an individual, at once like and unlike his fellow men, and as an individual he has not simply a moral task to perform in the world, but a task that is peculiarly his own.

CHAPTER II

MAN'S NATURAL MORAL STATE

The Moral Contradiction in Man. Man's natural moral state stands in striking contradiction to the Scriptural ideal for which he was originally created. That ideal consists in likeness to God, not in the Platonic sense of love for the beautiful, but in the existence in man of the divine moral image. The original state of man was one of harmony and fellowship with God; but through sin it was replaced with one of enmity and alienation from God by wicked works (Col. 1:21). Having abused the freedom of the will which was given him for the voluntary choice of the good by employing it for the choice of evil, man has not only become guilty in God's sight, but possesses in his inner self an hereditary corruption of his nature, consisting of a wrong inclination of his will away from God and an inability to choose God as his Highest Good or to live in harmony with His will.

The proper ethical state in man can be restored only by the grace and power of God, which, operating through the Gospel, produces an inner transformation in him. Man must undergo a complete change of mind (*metanoia*), be made to face in a different direction (*conversion*), and become a new man in Christ (*regeneration*), so that in his inmost being he is brought back to harmony with God. Even the heathen have felt that there was something radically wrong with man. But they never on the basis of natural religion attained a genuine conception of the sinfulness of sin, never solved the mystery of its origin, and never found a means for its removal.

The Origin of Sin. The only true and satisfactory account of the origin of sin in this world is that which is given to us in the third chapter of Genesis. God is not the author of sin. At the end of His work of creation He looked on all that He had made, and behold it was very good. But the devil, in the form of a serpent, tempted man, and the fall into sin followed.

There are those who declare that the sin in Eden was too small and trivial to have been the cause of all the consequences that have been ascribed to it. But the sin in Eden must not be judged by the apparently trivial outward act, but by the inner state which led to it. It was an act of direct disobedience to God, a setting up of the human will in opposition to the divine will. The inevitable result was the breaking of the harmony and concord which had hitherto existed between the Creator and the creature.

There are those who find fault with God for placing that particular tree in Eden and giving that particular prohibition to Adam and Eve. They conceive that there would have been no fall if the tree had not been there. But it is to be remembered that Adam and Eve as personal beings could not escape the necessity of deciding for or against God and the right. As moral beings they were bound to act, and their acts would be right or wrong. It was God's will that, by making a right decision now and by continuing to make right decisions afterwards, their native righteousness should become a personal habitual righteousness.

Is it not altogether likely that the tree was placed there in order to make the test upon man's will in the easiest way possible? Where there were thousands of trees it could not have been a hardship to leave a single tree severely alone. A decision for the right in this case would have made it easier for man to make further decisions for the right. His test was meant to prepare him for further tests which as a free-will being he could not hope to escape.

It is noteworthy that the Serpent brought his temptation to bear on Eve. He doubtless did so, because woman, being more readily swayed by her feelings, could be more easily deceived than man. Adam was not deceived (1 Tim. 2:14). Eve believed the serpent's words; Adam did not. Perhaps Adam said to himself, "Eve is lost, I love her and will share her fate." To some persons this action, viewed from the conjugal standpoint, may appear noble. But from the ethical standpoint it was sinful: for it showed that he loved Eve more than God.

The temptation in Eden is in a general way a type of all temptations. It involved the lust of the flesh or the appetites, the lust of the eye or the vanities of the world, and the pride of life or the elevation of self. It has been argued that under these three types all sins may be subsumed. But it is only in a general way that the three appeals in the first sin are types of the appeals contained in all sins.

The Nature of Sin. There is a tendency on the part of many to regard evil as a concrete thing, as an entity which exists by itself. But evil or sin has no such extraneous existence. Sin does not and cannot exist apart from a personal being. Sin consists in the free-will act of the personal creature by which he opposes his own will to God's. It exists; but it exists as an evil determination or quality of the will. This disposes of the theory of the eternal existence of evil as a substance antagonistic to God.

Formally, then, we may define sin as the antagonism of the human will to the divine. It is the inclination of the will at an angle to the divine will. There ought to be perfect harmony between the human will and the divine. When there is not, there is sin. And sin may, therefore, be briefly defined as the wrong inclination of the will.

Materially, sin is a condition of unlikeness to God. It is the bringing into existence by the human will of that which ought not to exist. It consists in the fact that man is not and does not do what God wills that he should be and do. It is the existence of a contradiction between the ideal and the actual, between what is commanded and what is.

Sin is not a stage in man's necessary development toward perfection (evolution), nor a defect due to finiteness or incompleteness in the unfolding of the good (pantheism). It is not a physical thing, the result of our sensuous nature (Plato), nor mere ignorance (Socrates), nor a lack of adjustment to environment. But it is the antithesis of the good, the negation of God's will. It is the selfish elevation of the human will into the normative place of the divine.

The evolutionary theory maintains that the fall was not a fall, or else a fall upward, a crisis in the evolution of the moral consciousness of man in passing from the brute to the human stage of development, and that eventually we will evolve out of sin. The pantheist maintains that everything which we call bad is really good because it is an unfolding of God.

Plato explained the existence of sin as due to an evil inherent in matter. Christian asceticism locates sin in the body. But sin is not at all a material thing. It does not consist of bodily actions, but lies in the will. If a man takes away and secretes jewels lying on a table, the act is sinful or not according as he owns or does not own them. Sin lies not in the body which acts, but in the soul which directs its activity. The body is only the instrument through which the acting subject, the soul, operates.

Original Sin. As a result of the first sin there ensued a moral separation or alienation from God, a rupture of the fellowship between man and God, and a moral corruption of man's nature. His intellect was no longer as clear and powerful as it would have been without the fall; his feelings were vitiated; and his will was perverted and enfeebled. From the ethical standpoint the corruption of the will is of prime importance. The will has obtained a permanent inclination away from God. The image of God in the narrow sense as moral perfection was lost. And the descendants of Adam and Eve, being descendants of sinful parents, have been born as sinful beings, whose will has a natural bent or inclination away from God. Man is still metaphysically the image of God. Sin has not changed the substance of his nature, and he is still a person, self-conscious and self-determining. But it has changed the quality of his nature. He is no longer a perfect but a sinful person.

This original sin is universal in extent. "All men born after the common course of nature are born without the fear of God and without trust in Him, and with concupiscence" (Augs. Conf., Art. II). The only exception among men is our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who was not born after the common course of nature, and had no father but God.

Because of this original sin which is found in every man, the will is in an unethical state. Man is not morally the kind of being he ought to be. And still worse, he does not have in himself the power to be the kind of a being he ought to be or to do the things which he ought to do. The natural man is both unwilling and unable to do the will of God. He suffers from an impairment of the will which prevents it from functioning in the higher or divine realm of morality, while still free to function in the lower, earthly and temporal realm. Many men who are not Christians lead moral lives; but their morality, however admirable from the merely human standpoint, is radically defective in that it does not spring from faith as its vital principle and from love as its active principle. So long as they are not reconciled to God through Christ and brought in their inmost selves into harmony with Him, their will does not and cannot function in unison with His, and their morality is not fundamentally of the kind which He requires.

Actual Sins. Because of the natural inborn inclination to sin, man falls into actual sins, or sins of acts, as soon as he is old enough to act. As soon as he begins to will, he wills what he ought not, and fails to will what he ought. Original sin is the source or fountain; actual sins are the stream which flows from it. Original sin is the disease that afflicts our human nature; actual sins are the manifestations and symptoms of the disease. Hence man cannot be made good from the outside. The disease must be cured, if the symptoms are to cease; the fountain must be sealed, if the stream is to dry up.

Because of this inward defect of original sin, the legalist errs when he supposes that he can produce a good man by means of the observance of outward rules and regulations. The cure of sin must be radical, and must take place within. Man must be transformed in the very center of his being, undergo a complete change of mind, and be born again. A new life-principle must be implanted within him, a life-principle which, located in the pure ego or self, may gradually through the coöperation of the divine and human wills extend its dominion over all the surrounding areas of the wider self or "Me," with the aim of bringing our entire being, body and soul, into subjection to the law of Christ.

Kinds of Sin. The way in which sin manifests itself outwardly differs in various persons. Some are more likely to be victims of certain kinds of sins than others. Age, sex, nationality, occupation and the spirit of the times have much to do with the particular sins to which men are prone.

The actual sins which men commit may be classified according to the point of view from which they are regarded, as Sins of Commission and Omission; Sins of Thought, Word and Deed; Sins against God, against Self or against Fellow Men; Sins of Deliberation and Sins of Weakness.

A sin of commission is the doing of what is forbidden; a sin of omission is a failure to do what is commanded. The vast majority of men's sins are sins of omission. The commandment says that we should love the Lord our God with all our heart and with all our mind and with all our soul and with all our strength, and our neighbor as ourselves; and that we should give perfect expression to this love in all that we think and say and do. But there is no human being who does not innumerable times omit the thinking, saying and doing of that to which the moral law obligates him. We do not even see all the opportunities which are ours for serving God and our neighbor, and we are far from making full use of those opportunities which we do see.

Many persons count only the sins of commission; and they imagine that they are sinless because they have avoided gross outward transgressions. But a man is not a good man if he simply does not commit gross sins. A good man is one who deliberately and determinedly does right. Christ summed up the meaning of the law positively in the great commandment of love, and again in the Golden Rule.

The Christian is taught in the Lord's Prayer to pray daily for the forgiveness of sins. He will daily need it. But this does not mean that he will daily need forgiveness for gross transgressions. It is the sins of omission chiefly with which the true Christian has to contend. He fails to live up to the Christian law of life as he knows he ought. This was what troubled St. Paul, as we see in the seventh chapter of Romans. He had difficulty in bringing all his powers and faculties and activities into perfect harmony with his love to Christ. Hence he cried, "O wretched man that I am; who will deliver me from the body of this death?" Of course, if the Christian falls into gross sins he needs forgiveness also. But most of his sins are sins of omission.

Sins may be classified also as sins of thought, word and deed. Here again men form false notions of their own morality. They "make clean the outside of the cup and the platter," but are not concerned about the uncleanness within. But "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." There is a lust of the eye which is adultery, and a hatred of the heart which is murder. It is possible to slay men with the tongue of slander. Not only for their deeds, but for their words and their thoughts, men must give an account to God.

Sins may be classified further as sins against God, against self and against our fellow men. In the strict sense, all sins are sins against God; for the moral law is the expression of His will, and every infraction is opposition to His will. But we may quite properly distinguish between sins which, like cursing, are transgressions directly against God, and those which, like stealing, are offenses indirectly against God and directly against our fellow men.

An important classification is that which distinguishes between sins of deliberation and those of weakness. Even the most sincere Christian is guilty of the latter. Because of the frailty of human nature which still clings to him, he is not able to live up to the level of his ideals and falls short of the performance of his full duty. The old evil nature persists in him alongside of the new nature implanted by grace; and he finds a law in his flesh which wars against the law of his mind, so that the good which he would he does not, and the evil which he would not, that he does. But as a Christian he will not be guilty of willful and deliberate sin. If he sins deliberately and willfully he falls from grace and needs conversion.

The distinction between venial and mortal sins made by the Roman Catholic Church is not tenable. In themselves considered all sins are mortal. On the other hand, all sins if repented of, are venial. And while there is a sense in which we might call sins of weakness venial sins, inasmuch as in the case of the Christian they are at once forgiven; and while there is a sense in which we might call deliberate sins mortal since because they involve a fall from grace; it is better not to employ these distinctions. The terms venial and mortal sins have by usage obtained so definite a meaning in the Roman Catholic sense, that their use in any other sense by Protestants is likely to lead to confusion of thought. It will help us to be clear on this point if we remember that sin is a personal thing; that it is the person who is sinful and guilty, and the person who must be forgiven. Strictly speaking God does not forgive the sin but the sinner. He forgives those persons who repent and believe; He does not forgive those who are impenitent.

The Sin against the Holy Ghost. The Sin against the Holy Ghost has the mournful distinction of being the one sin that is unforgivable. It is mentioned in the Scriptures as unpardonable, but its nature is not accurately described in them. It is clear from the Word of God that every sin which is truly repented of and for which forgiveness is sought in Christ's name will be forgiven. It appears from this fact and from various passages in which a fall from grace is referred to, that the sin against the Holy Ghost is one which precludes the possibility of repentance. It must be of such a character that he who commits it does not and cannot repent. It must involve such a rejection of the saving grace of God as makes salvation impossible for him. In the nature of the case this sin must be rare, and must have in it something of a diabolical character. It is doubtless the rejection of the known truth and the acceptance of the known error in its stead, and a virtual saying with Satan, "Evil, be thou my good," and "Falsehood, be thou my truth." Many good souls have been troubled lest they have committed the unpardonable sin. But the very fact that they are troubled and distressed about the matter is proof that they have not committed it. He who has committed the sin against the Holy Ghost is one who is so hardened in sin and iniquity, that his sins have absolutely ceased to trouble him.

Sins Alike in Essence. In essence all sins are alike. Their essential nature is the same, because in the last analysis they all resolve themselves into an opposition of the human will to the divine. They differ in their manifestations and characteristics, and in the degrees of guilt which they involve.

But in essence the great and the small sins, the sins of thought, word and deed, and the sins of commission and of omission are alike. Each in itself spells alienation from God and opposition to His will.

Degrees of Guilt. While all sins are alike in essence, they differ in the degrees of guilt which they involve. This difference is dependent in the first place upon the character of the sin itself. Murder is worse than theft, and this fact is recognized by human law in the infliction of a severer penalty upon the murderer. The difference is also dependent upon the person who commits the sin. What outwardly is the same sin involves a larger degree of guilt on the part of a Christian than on that of an unbeliever. More may justly be expected of the Christian. Further the degree of guilt is dependent on the intention of the person committing it. One who through carelessness or neglect brings harm or injury to others is guilty; but one who maliciously brings harm upon others is involved in deeper guilt. Finally, while sin in the thought is real sin, the deed added to the thought increases the guilt. He who hates his brother is indeed a murderer; but he who carries out his hatred into actual murder adds atrociousness to his sin and enormously increases his guilt.

The Ethical Consequences of Sin. What are the ethical consequences of sin? We are not inquiring here concerning all the consequences, but concerning those only which are significant from the standpoint of morality. The first to which we call attention is guilt. The existence of sin is referred to its author, man. It is he who by his wrong act of the will has brought the sin into being, and he is accountable for it. Since it is a thing which ought not to exist, man as the cause of it is guilty. This guilt is one of which his own conscience, when it functions properly, as well as the law of God given in the Scriptures, convicts him. It makes of him one who rests under the disfavor of his better self and of God, and who deserves punishment.

Another consequence is man's moral alienation from God. Sin stands as a barrier which prevents the right relation from existing between man and God. Instead of friendship and fellowship, there is on God's part a righteous wrath against a rebellious creature, and on man's part an enmity and hostility against God. Because of sin unrepented of and loved by man, there is not that oneness of mind and that unity of purpose between him and God which must lie at the basis of true fellowship. The natural man has no desire as well as no fitness for genuine fellowship with God.

Another consequence of sin is the moral inability of the human will. The natural man not only does not desire to serve God, but he is unable to serve Him. In that higher sphere of morality which has to do with the correspondence of our wills with God's and with the doing of all things out of love to God as the fundamental motive, the will of the natural man is wholly incapacitated. We have laid down the principle that there can be no ethical being and no moral responsibility without free will. And the principle is absolutely sound. But at the same time we must bear in mind that there are the two kinds of freedom already referred to, the freedom in matters earthly and temporal, and the freedom in matters spiritual. Whatever the will of man is able to accomplish in the lower sphere, it is not only feeble but absolutely powerless in the higher sphere. No man can by his own natural power will in harmony with the will of God. He has lost that power by the fall, and can regain it only by the grace of God in regeneration. Like the arm which, by reason of a sudden and violent wrench, can be raised to the level of the shoulder but no higher, and can function as an arm on the lower level but not on the higher until the disability is removed; so the will of man has been rendered unable to function in the higher region of the spiritual, though still able to function in the realm of the civil and earthly. And the disability to function in the higher sphere remains until removed by God in regeneration. Man is utterly powerless to restore the lost ability to himself.

This higher freedom, however, which the natural man lacks, is the true freedom. Man was created for a life in harmony and fellowship with God. He cannot and does not realize his true self until that harmony and fellowship are reëstablished. He cannot fulfill the very purpose for which as a moral being he was meant and constituted, unless he lives in moral unity with God. How can a man be said to possess real freedom when his will has been so warped and bent by sin that it cannot be straightened, and when it has been so set at an angle to God's will that it cannot be made to run parallel to it? "The service of God is true freedom." Only in that service does man fulfill the purpose of his creation as a moral being.

Necessity and Nature of Redemption. In view of the natural moral state of man it is evident that he is in need of redemption. And this redemption must be an ethical redemption, and not simply a redemption from the punishment of sin.

The ideal of morality is life in fellowship with God. How can this fellowship be reëstablished? How can man be freed from the guilt and power of sin, so that God can view him with favor, and that man can and will view God with favor? Two things are needed if this result is to be accomplished.

The guilt of man must be removed by saving grace, so that God can love him, not only with the love of compassion, but with the love of complacency. And again, the inability of the human will must be removed by an inner transformation in him, so that he can and will love God and find blessedness in His service. This means that the sinner must be brought to faith in Christ, so that he may be justified by God for Christ's sake, and so that he may love and serve God. This implies the necessity of the regeneration of the sinner, which is provided for in the redemption of Jesus Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit in the heart.

When we speak of the redemption of Jesus Christ, we must bear in mind the nature and purpose of that redemption. When the angel announced the name of the Infant Savior, he gave as the reason for calling him Jesus, that He should "save His people from their sins." The words are significant. Christ came not to save people *in* their sins, but *from* their sins. The only way in which people can be saved is by saving them from their sins. There are many persons whose conception of salvation is not at all that which is here laid down. They conceive of salvation simply as a salvation from the punishment of sin, as a rescue from the pains of hell, and as a transfer from a place of sorrow such as this world is to another which is called heaven and which is free from sorrow and pain. At bottom their conception of heaven is like the Mohammedans', less gross and carnal indeed, but essentially the same kind of heaven, a place simply of happiness. But the distinctive characteristic of heaven is not the presence of happiness, but the absence of sin and the universal reign of perfect harmony and love. Redemption is not simply a matter of transferring men from one place to another, but the much more vital and fundamental matter of making out of them the kind of persons who are fit for heaven. This is the point to which the apostle refers, when he gives thanks "unto the Father which hath made us *meet* to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col. 1:12).

The purpose of redemption is eventually to undo completely the work of the devil in Eden, and to restore the fellowship between men and God which was there broken by sin. And this can be done, not by any change merely in man's location, but must be done by a change within man, where the real damage of sin is located. By the fall man ceased to be the kind of a person he ought to be; and by the redemption of Christ he is to be made again into the kind of person he ought to be. Not only the punishment of sin must be taken away from him, but the ethical consequences of the fall must be removed. The damage to man's moral nature must be remedied, and he must be radically renewed in the very center of his being, that eventually he may be renewed in every part. All this means simply that he must be saved from the *guilt* and from the *power* of sin. And this cannot take place without that radical inner transformation which is called regeneration.

Redemption makes provision for the removal of man's guilt through the justification of the sinner for Christ's sake. Taking our sins upon Him, the holy and guiltless God-man atoned for them by His sufferings and His death upon the cross; and by His holy and perfect life He provided a positive righteousness which is imputed to all who believe in Him. What Christ has done and suffered is imputed to the believer, and he is justified or counted righteous for Christ's sake. Thus his guilt is taken away and he possesses in Christ's righteousness a robe which makes him appear guiltless and spotless before God. He is now viewed by God with favor and complacency for Christ's sake. "There is no condemnation for them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). Their guilt is taken away, free pardon is bestowed, and they are regarded and treated as righteous persons. So far as the demands of God's justice are concerned the way is now cleared for the establishment of fellowship between God and man.

But there is another side to this process of redemption and salvation; namely, the freeing of man from the power of sin so that he is able to and does love God. In the nature of the case fellowship must include a right attitude both on the part of God and of man. And if, on the one hand, the guilt which would prevent God from viewing man with favor must be removed; so, on the other hand, the enmity against God which would prevent man from viewing God with favor must be removed also. And the removal of this enmity is included in God's plan of redemption. The sinner who has been brought to faith by the work of the Holy Spirit in his heart, and who in view of that faith is justified and counted righteous by God, has in the very process of being brought to faith undergone a radical inner change or transformation. This inner change is described in some places in Scripture as a complete change of mind (Greek: *metanoia*, poorly translated by the English word repentance). At the opening of His public ministry the Lord said to His hearers: "Undergo a change of mind; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 4:17). This change of mind is a condition of entrance into the kingdom and sharing its benefits. Essentially the same necessity of an inner change or transformation, though viewed from a different standpoint, is pointed out to Nicodemus by Christ in the statement, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). In both cases the necessity of a radical inner ethical change or transformation in man is laid down.

This inner transformation is provided for in the work of the Holy Spirit when He brings the sinner to repentance and faith. For faith means nothing less than an inner revolution, a complete change of attitude toward God and the things of God. He who was once at enmity with God now as a believer trusts in God and loves Him in Jesus Christ. If faith may be described, as Dorner describes it, as "a willing consent to be loved," it is easy to see the force of the apostle's statement, that "we love Him because He first loved us." God loves all men, and has given His Son to die for them all. But the believer is one who appreciates God's love, who lets it save him from the guilt of his sins, and who in the process of that saving has been changed in his innermost self from a being who hated and disobeyed God to one who loves God, whose fundamental desire is to do God's will, and who knows no higher joy than the joy of being enabled to walk in God's ways. Thus God and man are reconciled; and, through the continued process of sanctification which extends through the believer's whole life on earth, the fellowship established is more and more confirmed by the gradual but increasing development of the new spiritual life bestowed in regeneration.

Christianity alone presents the true ideal of the moral life; and Christianity alone gives men the power to attain it—imperfectly indeed in this world, but perfectly in the next.

CHAPTER III

THE MORAL LAW

The Nature of the Moral Law. By the moral law we mean the law which man as a moral being is obligated to obey, and which comes to him in the twofold form of an inner law of conscience and of an external positive law. The obligation which this law imposes is one of duty, and is expressed by an "ought." The "ought" belongs to the realm of the free will; the "must," on the other hand, belongs to the sphere of necessity.

The moral law presents itself to man, not as an abstract idea of moral perfection, but as the demand of a Higher Will upon his. It speaks with the voice of authority. He may disregard its demands; but he is conscious that he ought not to do so. He may disobey; but he knows that he cannot do so with impunity. It obligates him both with regard to what he ought to be and what he ought to do. It enjoins a moral state as well as moral acts. It is in no sense arbitrary or variable. It is not an ideal of right evolved from the social experience of mankind and liable to change as that experience grows or changes. It is not the crystallized result of habits and customs in the individual and the State. It is a definite, permanent and immutable norm. Its real content is and of necessity must be ever the same. Compliance with its demand is essential to harmony and fellowship with God. In man's original state the demand and the response to it were in perfect accord. But the entrance of sin has changed the accord into a discord. The demand of the law is one which man does not and cannot meet.

Is the moral law good because God commands it, or does He command it because it is good? The reply is a double affirmative. The will of God as expressed in the moral law is not an arbitrary one, but is grounded in the very nature of God. The moral law is good, because it is an expression of God's holy nature. At the same time, it is good because God commands it; for God would not and could not command anything that was not good. The moral law contains the essence of morality, the things which morally are absolutely necessary and inevitable. Hence it is a fundamental delusion to suppose that God can change His law or lower its requirements in order to accommodate His demands to the weakness of men.

We distinguish here, however, between the will of God as revealed in the *moral* law and the will of God as revealed in the *ceremonial* law of the Jews. While the moral law is grounded in God's very nature and is the expression of the fundamentally and unalterably moral, the ceremonial law is the result of the free choice of God in the sense that He might have laid down some different requirements, if He had seen fit to do so. The ceremonial law was arbitrary (in the good sense) and temporal in character; but the moral law is absolutely unchangeable and permanent. The fact that it is grounded in the nature and will of God stamps it as universally and permanently obligatory, and objectively fixed and immutable.

To conceive of the law as simply enjoining a mode of outward conduct is to misconceive and underrate its purpose and significance, and to reduce morality to a shallow externalism. The fundamental concern of the law is with our inmost self; and its fundamental requirement is a right inner attitude toward God and man. Just in so far as a man *is* what he ought to be, can he be depended on to *do* what he ought to do. Those who imagine that they can please God by external observances and works while their heart is not right with Him are grossly self-deceived.

The Law in Conscience. Conscience is the natural moral guide of mankind. There is nowhere a race of men so degraded as to be utterly devoid of moral sense. The heathen, who do not possess the revealed law of God, have the law written in their hearts (Rom. 2:14, 15). As man came from the hands of his Creator, he had a clear and adequate knowledge of God's will. He did not need the Ten Commandments, because he had them in himself. He found the moral law embodied in his very being, and he knew by nature what was his right relation to God, to self, and to the world. But with the fall there came an obscuration of that law which grew greater as man fell deeper and deeper into sin. Parts of the law in conscience have become erased and illegible; but remnants of it and the feeling of moral obligation remain in all men.

The External Human Law. The external positive law is rendered necessary by the obscuration of the inner law of conscience. The external *human* law is the political expression of the common moral consciousness of the community or the nation. In the nature of the case it is imperfect. As the expression of the moral judgment of fallible persons, human legislation is necessarily fallible. Human laws will be of a high moral character according as their framers possess an enlightened conscience and are actuated by a high moral sense.

The External Divine Law. This is the moral law revealed in the Holy Scriptures. It is comprised in the double commandment of love, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Matt. 22:37-39; Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18). The Ten Commandments, which are frequently called the Moral Law, are ten applications of the moral law—ten ways in which love to God and man is to exhibit itself. The Ten Commandments are identical with the moral law only when the full content of the law of love is read into them. They must be interpreted in the light of the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount and of the rest of Scripture, and must be understood and explained according to their spirit and not simply according to their letter.

The necessity for the supernatural revelation of the moral law is found in the fact that the moral law in conscience became greatly obscured by sin. It is not correct to say that the moral law is a restatement of the law in conscience; for the law in conscience has become partly erased, while the external divine law is a clear, full and unmistakable statement of the divine will, and the infallible and authoritative norm of morality for all men. It is the perfect guide to a truly moral life.

CHAPTER IV

CONSCIENCE

Definition of Conscience. Conscience has been defined by some as a special faculty of the soul. It is supposed to be a *moral faculty* as distinguished from the other faculties of the mind, such as the memory, the understanding, the will, etc. But the human mind is a unit and possesses no special faculties of any kind. It has many and marvelous powers, but it is the mind itself which exercises these powers. The mind no more possesses a special faculty of morality than it possesses a special faculty of religion. The fact is, that in the activity which we call conscience the mind functions through the same powers which it employs on other matters; namely, thinking, feeling and willing. It employs the intellect in discovering the right which it is our duty to do; it involves the feelings in the action that is proposed or that has been done; and the behest of conscience is unavailing unless it is carried out by the will.

Conscience is the mind itself acting through all its powers in the moral sphere. It is the self morally directing and judging its own activity. We have been created moral beings, and as such we are compelled by our very nature to view all our activity with respect to its moral quality. Everything that we do has an ethical aspect. Morality is so inwrought into every fiber of our being that we cannot, if we would, escape from the consciousness that every thought, word or deed is either right or wrong. The commonest acts of everyday life cannot be divested of their ethical significance. The moral sense is built into our whole psychological and spiritual nature.

Conscience has also been defined by some persons as the voice of God in us. That its voice stands in some relation to the voice of God is true. But if we define conscience as the voice of God, how shall we explain the fact that the consciences of two men tell them to pursue an opposite course? Certainly God cannot contradict Himself. And just as certainly conscience cannot safely be defined as the voice of God in us.

The voice of conscience is really our own voice. Conscience is man himself as a moral being speaking to himself. If it be said that God speaks to us in conscience, that can only mean that He speaks to us through the moral nature which He has constituted in us. He does not in conscience speak to us directly and from the outside.

The Basis of Conscience in Personality. The justification for the definition of conscience as the self morally directing and judging its own activity is found in the fact that man is a person, possessed of self-consciousness and self-determination, and hence that he is in his very nature a moral being. Personality and morality cannot be divorced; one involves the other. As a person, man is a being from whom and from whose acts morality is inseparable. To take morality out of man would be to destroy him as a human being. Morality is of the very essence of his nature. It is the thing which distinguishes him from the other creatures of the earth, and makes him *sui generis.* Man is always aware, even in the commonest and apparently most insignificant acts, that God and himself are approving or condemning what he is doing. And hence conscience is not something impersonal within him telling him what to do, but is the man telling himself to do thus and so.

The fact that man was created a personal being, with self-consciousness and self-determination, excludes the theory that God originally made him an unmoral or morally neutral being, and then added to his endowments a moral faculty or a moral quality of some kind which changed him into a moral being. In making man a person, God at once made him an ethical being.

At the basis of the activity of conscience lie the two characteristics of personality; namely, self-consciousness and self-determination.

Because man is a self-determining being, he chooses what he will do. He knows that his will is a real cause, and that he is, therefore, by his acts the author of that which is either right or wrong, good or evil. What he does is a personal act of his, for which he is accountable, and in which there is an inescapable moral quality. He has the consciousness that his right relation to the moral norm is so vital a matter to him as a person, that an injury to that relation constitutes an injury to his very self.

Self-consciousness also is an important factor in the activity which we call conscience. By reason of his self-consciousness man can and does make himself the object of his own reflection, and is at once the subject and the object of thought. Men often speak to themselves as if they were separate persons spoken to. And there is perhaps no sphere in which this speaking to one's self is more frequent than the moral. Man says to himself, "This is the right thing to do." He says to himself, "Do this thing which is right." He calls himself up before himself to judgment, and says to himself, "Why did you do this thing which you ought not to have done, and which I told you not to do?" This characteristic of self-consciousness, whether regarded simply from the intellectual or from the moral side, is one of the great mysteries of personality. But it is a fact, and it forms an essential element in the activity of conscience.

It should be observed that the term conscience, useful as it is in so many ways, and indispensable as it has become by usage in the consideration of moral questions, is yet a term which in many respects is inadequate for the purpose. It lends itself quite readily to the misleading notion that it is the direct voice of God speaking to us from the outside, or that it is a separate power like perception, memory, judgment, feelings, and other powers of the mind. It really designates the moral activity of the ego or the self. I, a moral being, am the acting subject back of all the activity which we call conscience. I direct, command, and judge myself and my actions. I study out my duty; I tell myself to do my duty; and I take myself to task for not doing my duty. The word conscience has come into use as a word to describe this entire activity. It is not a word which is meant scientifically to describe the psychological or metaphysical reality, but is a word which describes from the popular standpoint the activity of the self or person in the moral sphere. It is not simply a voice, nor is it a special moral faculty, but it is a far-reaching and comprehensive activity of the ego functioning through all the powers of the soul with respect to every moral issue. It is the whole mind dealing with the moral aspect of all its acts.

Conscience Both Divine and Human. When we say that conscience cannot be defined as the voice of God in us, we do not mean that there is nothing divine in it. There is both a human and a divine element in conscience. The human element appears in the fact that it is man speaking to himself. The divine element appears in the fact that it is God speaking through the moral nature which He has constituted in us. The "ought" with which conscience obligates us thus proceeds from a power which is above us and at the same time proceeds from our inmost selves.

The Normative Function of Conscience. The activity of conscience is threefold: It determines what is our duty; it commands us to do our duty; and it calls us to account if we fail to do our duty. The functions of conscience may therefore be classified as the Normative or Self-directing, the Imperative or Self-commanding, and the Forensic or Self-judging.

By the Normative Function we understand that activity by virtue of which conscience determines what is right and duty, and points out the path which we ought to pursue. While this activity involves the whole mind, since the mind is a unit and no faculty can act independently of the others, it is specifically an activity of the intellect. It is the activity by which man perceives with greater or less correctness and reliability the rightness or wrongness of acts, and forms moral judgments. It has to do with the determination of duty. It answers the question, What ought I to do? The answer to that question depends on a number of considerations, which are: the law, as containing the guiding principle of conduct; and the circumstances of the case as one factor and ourselves as another factor in determining the particular duty which results from the application of the law to the case.

The determination of duty by conscience is not always easy; and the decisions of conscience as to duty are not infallible. There is needed for correctness of moral judgment first of all a thorough knowledge of the law and a correct understanding of its meaning. Any misconception on this point will vitiate the moral judgment, because its conclusion will be based on a wrong premise. But even when the law has been properly apprehended, mistakes may be made in the application of the law to the specific case in hand. There may be a false or imperfect understanding of the needs of the situation and of the particular action or actions needed to meet them. The law may be quite clear. But I require more than the knowledge of the law to determine my duty. The law requires that I should love my neighbor. But how am I to exercise my love to him? Before I can answer that question and determine my duty in the case, I must know the nature of his need. He may need food or drink or clothing or shelter. And perhaps while he needs all these things, my duty is not that I should bring him food or drink or clothing or house rent, but that I should find him employment.

Again my duty cannot be determined without taking into consideration myself and my particular powers of helping my needy neighbor. What might be another's duty under the particular circumstances may not be mine. My personality must enter into the equation, if the problem of my duty is to be correctly solved. What Christ would do under the circumstances has been proposed by some as the standard of action. But Christ was a being of vastly greater resources and powers than I am; and what He would do might readily be something which I could not possibly do. Not what Christ would do, but what Christ would have me do under these circumstances is the decisive factor. And conscience in its normative function is therefore bound to take into consideration the acting self as a determining factor in arriving at moral judgments. If a man has broken an arm and I am the first to learn of it, my duty is to notify the family or the physician; but the physician's duty is to set the broken bone.

In the determination of duty, conscience begins with seeking to ascertain the principle of action as laid down in the law. That principle is found either in the natural law of conscience or in the external positive law. The heathen, not having the divine external positive law, must determine his duty on the basis of the natural law of conscience and of the law laid down in the statute books of the state and the customs of the community. He has at best fallible guides. The law of conscience is partly erased and not completely legible; the laws of the state and of the municipality in which he lives have been framed by men whose moral perceptions like his own are imperfect and whose moral judgments like his are fallible. He is in danger, therefore, of making mistakes with respect to his duty because of the lack of an absolutely reliable standard or norm by which to decide.

The Christian on the other hand has the revealed law of God. This law is perfect. It is a definite, clear and unmistakable statement of the will of God, which is the moral norm for his creatures. It is an infallible guide to the right, and the absolute criterion of the moral. But when we say this, we do not mean to imply that man necessarily always understands and uses that law aright. The scribes and Pharisees had the revealed law of God; yet the Sermon on the Mount and other sayings of our Lord show that they had in many respects failed to understand the law correctly, had externalized its demands, and had robbed it of its deeper meaning. And there is always danger that, owing to the imperfection which still clings to man's nature in spite of the inner regeneration and renewal by the Holy Spirit, the Christian himself may fail to apprehend the teaching of the revealed law perfectly, and because of this failure be mistaken in his judgment as to his duty. As a matter of fact, the conscience may err in any one of the three factors that must be considered in the determination of duty: it may misapprehend the meaning of the law, or fail to appreciate properly the demands of the situation, or wrongly estimate the manner in which the self is obligated to apply the principle contained in the law to the need embodied in the situation.

Conscience Not an Infallible Guide. If the question be asked whether conscience is an infallible guide, the answer must be that it is not. There is no absolute guarantee that when a man follows his conscience he will certainly do that which in itself considered is the right thing to do. He may be fully persuaded that he is doing what is right, and yet he may be mistaken. Two conscientious men quite frequently take opposite sides on a moral issue. Certainly one or the other must be mistaken. Owing to the damage done to our nature by sin, a damage not wholly removed in this world by grace, conscience may and frequently does err. The degree in which it is a reliable guide depends on the degree in which it is enlightened.

Conscience may not only err, but may completely reverse its moral judgment. Paul conscientiously persecuted the Christians, imagining that he was doing God a service. When later on his conscience became enlightened, he just as conscientiously ceased from his persecutions and identified himself with the despised followers of Jesus. With new light upon the subject there frequently comes a change of moral conviction. For centuries slavery was regarded as consistent with the principles of Christianity, and many good men were slaveholders. To-day the Christian conscience with unanimous consent condemns slavery as utterly at variance with the principles laid down in the Christian religion. With increasing light comes increasing discernment between right and wrong, between good and evil. The necessity of seeking all possible enlightenment is evident. We shall never get a perfectly enlightened conscience in this world. But the more the Christian prays and the more he studies the Word of God, the less likely his conscience will be to make mistakes. His ability to make right decisions will constantly grow.

Hindrances to Correct Decisions. The decision as to duty is often difficult and wrong, because many things which ought not to be considered are consciously or unconsciously given some weight. There is a constant temptation to let personal considerations of ease, comfort, advantage and the like enter as a factor in the determination of duty. Men often claim to be acting conscientiously while at the same time they have permitted their decision to be influenced by factors which ought not to have exerted any influence at all. The reason why two men, both of whom claim to be conscientious, differ in their moral judgment often lies right here. One eliminates the considerations which ought not to count, and the other does not. It is one of the most difficult things in the world to let conscience function in such a way as to exclude utterly all considerations which ought not to have any influence on the decision. But he who would make truly ethical decisions must make them solely on the basis of the factors that ought to count. Only when he really seeks to do this, can a man claim to be acting conscientiously.

Further, it is to be borne in mind that ability grows by exercise, and that faculties become atrophied by disuse. The constant practice of making right decisions purely upon the basis of the right and wrong of the matter will gradually give increased ability to decide upon duty with unerring precision. On the other hand, the man who originally possessed the power of distinguishing with a fair degree of accuracy between right and wrong may gradually lose that ability because of protracted indifference to the genuinely moral character of his decisions.

Conscience Never to Be Disobeyed. It is to be laid down as an unalterable principle that a man dare never disobey his conscience. When he acts he must always do what his conscience tells him is right. If he does what he really believes to be wrong, he becomes a conscienceless fellow for whom no one, not even himself, can have any respect. He who discards the guidance of his conscience wanders about in utter moral blindness. There are, of course, cases in which conscience is in doubt as to what is right; we shall speak of such cases presently.

Because of these two facts: first, that man ought never to disobey his conscience, and secondly, that conscience is liable to err, it is possible that a man may be doing both right and wrong at the same time. He may be doing right *subjectively*, in so far as he is obeying his conscience and acting according to his convictions, while at the same time he may be doing wrong *objectively*, in so far as his conviction concerning the right may be a mistaken one. It may even happen that a conscienceless fellow who is subjectively doing a great wrong by acting against his conscience may objectively, by accident as it were, do what in itself is the right thing to do.

All this implies that we must give serious and prayerful attention to the moral issues on which we are called upon to make decisions, and must seek enlightenment from every available source. It means that we must get all the light that we can from the Word of God. It may mean that we should consult the opinion of others whose judgment we have reason to think will be good. In the last analysis, however, every person must make his own decision. He must obey his own conscience and not another's. The responsibility for the action will be his, and the decision as to the action must be his also.

The Imperative Function of Conscience. The Imperative or Self-commanding Function of conscience is that by virtue of which self commands self to do its duty. The determination of the duty belongs to the normative function; but the insistence that the duty be done belongs to the imperative function.

The command of conscience is not to be confused with the first impulse to pursue a certain course, or with the impression that we ought to do a certain thing. Men sometimes vainly seek to justify themselves by saying that they acted conscientiously, when as a matter of fact they acted simply on impulse.

The command of conscience is imperative and unconditional. Men may hesitate and frame all sorts of excuses for refusal to obey, but the conscience, so long as it speaks at all, speaks ever the same command, Do your duty. It is unrelenting and inexorable; it will not take no for an answer; and it recognizes no excuses for failure to obey. Whether the duty be pleasant or unpleasant, profitable or unprofitable, easy or difficult, is a matter of which conscience as such takes no account. As to what our particular duty may be, conscience may leave us in doubt because of its inability to discern our obligation clearly. But as to our obligation to do our duty, whatever that may be, it leaves us in no doubt whatever. Its command is insistent, categorical and inexorable. It insists on the performance of duty on pain of the inward condemnation of self by self. Even when it errs it insists on our doing what we have come to believe is our duty. We cannot disobey except at the cost of the violation of our own inner nature. Everything that is contrary to conscience is subjectively wrong and sinful, even if it should happen to be objectively right.

Presupposes the Normative Function. It is important to remember that the second function of conscience is not independent of the first. As an imperative function its sole office is to command us to do our duty. But in order to obey the command, we must know what our duty is. In a sense, therefore, the second function of conscience waits upon the first. All the while that the normative function is seeking to reach a decision, the imperative function keeps on saying, Do your duty. This insistence is a spur to the conscience to find out through the normative function what the duty is. If it were not for this spur on the part of the imperative function, the intellect would relax its efforts to discover the right. But because of the urge of the imperative function we keep on trying to determine what the duty is. The voice which says, "Do your duty," must always be heeded; but obedience presupposes the successful activity of the normative function.

When conscience by virtue of its normative activity declares that a certain action is my duty, then and then only can conscience by virtue of its imperative activity say, Do this thing. In the nature of the case it is impossible, except by merest accident, to do our duty unless we first know what it is. But when we know what our duty is, the command to do it is inexorable. There is no escape on the ground of convenience or expediency. Only when men have dulled their conscience by repeated disobedience can they disobey its command without the most trenchant reproof.

Doubt as to What Our Duty Is. What is to be done in those cases in which we are seriously in doubt as to what our duty is? That there are many such cases is a fact familiar to every conscientious person. Anxious to do right, he yet does not know what he ought to do, because his duty is not clear to him.

In the first place, if there is no necessity for immediate action, a man ought not to do anything as long as he is in doubt as to his duty. If he acts while he does not know what he ought to do, he is almost certain to do the wrong thing. The normative function of conscience must be given time to discover what our duty is by getting all the needed light upon the subject. Ordinarily we ought to act only when we are sure in our own minds that we know what is right; for only then are we in a position to do our duty. Conscience does not really command us to act until that time; it simply keeps on saying, Do your duty. All the while that the normative function is seeking to find out what our duty is, the imperative function simply insists that, when discovered, the duty shall be done. There are cases, however, in which we are compelled to act while we are still in some doubt as to what our duty really is. Having waited as long as possible in making our decision, the time has come when we can wait no longer, but must act. Having anxiously and prayerfully sought to become clear as to the right course to pursue, we yet are not clear. What is to be done? If we must act while still in doubt, nothing remains for us to do but to adopt the course which according to our best judgment seems most probably right, and to ask God to forgive us, if we are making a mistake.

Conscience in its imperative function not only categorically insists on obedience, but accompanies its command with a threat of penalty for disobedience. That penalty is the condemnation of self by self, accompanied by a conviction of condemnation by God. This threat of conscience is a powerful spur to obedience to its commands.

The Forensic Function of Conscience. The Forensic or Self-judging Function is that activity of conscience by virtue of which self calls itself up before itself to judgment, asks for an account of its action, and condemns itself for wrong. Owing to the wonderful power of self-consciousness which belongs to us, this judgment is as real and dramatic as if two different persons were concerned in it. Self is at once the accuser and the accused, the prosecuting attorney and the defendant, the judge and the criminal, the executioner and the victim.

As a self-judging activity, it is the office of conscience to sit in judgment on our state and acts, and to approve or condemn us according as these harmonize or fail to harmonize with our conviction of the right. The judgment is accompanied by a corresponding activity of the feelings. According as conscience acquits or condemns, there is a feeling of inner satisfaction and peace, or of self-condemnation, unrest and distress. In the former case we have what is called a "good conscience"; in the latter, a "bad conscience."

Conscience Severe in Its Self-judgment. While it is the office of conscience to approve what is good and to condemn what is evil, it is very much more wrought up over evil acts than over good ones. The reason for this is plain. Conscience expects us to do what is right. When we obey its commands, everything is going as it should, and there is no occasion for excitement. We are, indeed, rewarded for doing our duty by the possession of inward peace and quiet. But conscience makes no particular ado about our good actions. It regards them as a matter of course, and as altogether in accordance with the fitness of things. If conscience were to make an extraordinary stir about a good action, it would be an indication that such an action is very unusual and fills our better self with astonishment. Conscience approves the good as well as disapproves the evil; but its praise and its blame are by no means equal in intensity.

The judgment of conscience upon evil actions is severe. The severity of its judgment is in proportion to the enormity of the evil which it conceives to have been done. The greater the guilt, the greater the condemnation which self visits upon self.

In this self-judging activity, self acting through the intellect exposes the evil that has been done, lays bare the subterfuges and fallacies under pretext of which the evil action was performed, and puts self to utter shame and confusion for its conduct. It acts through the sensibilities, in that the outraged conscience is indignant, and the worse self is stirred with mingled feelings of self-defense and humiliation. The inner self is divided against itself, torn with discord, accusing and excusing itself. The outcome of the discord will ordinarily be either the victory or the defeat of the better self. If the voice of conscience prevails, self is overwhelmed with regret, self-reproach and confusion, which should end in genuine repentance, but which sometimes leads to remorse and even to despair. The feelings of shame, self-abasement and humiliation, in case the evil done has been an atrocious one, reach an extreme which threatens to overwhelm the wrongdoer. Note, for example, the self-abasement of David in the fifty-first Psalm.

The sting of conscience lies not simply in the knowledge that a certain evil has been done, but in the distressing consciousness that we are the kind of persons who could have done such a thing. It is the existence in us of such an immoral state as could have led to the evil act, that fills us with shame and confusion. The inner condition of self-reproach or a "bad conscience" consequent upon an evil act is characterized by mental uneasiness and distress, and in some cases by absolute wretchedness.

The victory in this inner conflict of self with self is not always won by the better self. The conflict sometimes ends with a hardening of self in sin, a smothering of the voice of conscience, and a continuance of the evil which conscience has condemned. This state of affairs is full of the deadliest perils to the moral nature. Its logical outcome, if carried to its conclusion, is the complete deadening of conscience, the utter stifling of its voice, and the giving over of self to the dominion of sin.

Sometimes the inner conflict becomes for a period a drawn battle which leaves the self in a chronic state of contradiction with itself. But this state is accompanied by such feelings of unrest and of positive distress, that sooner or later a decision will be and must be made. Conscience can admit of no compromise, and eventually the result must be either a victory or a defeat for the right.

The Empirical Conscience. Are men's consciences all alike? The answer to this question depends on what is meant by it. All consciences are alike in their fundamental features—in their essential nature and in the functions which belong to them. For by conscience we mean the activity of the ego in the moral sphere. Conscience is not a power or faculty grafted on our nature by experience or developed to its present powers by a long course of heredity. It is our moral nature in action. And with that moral nature we are born. Conscience is not acquired but innate. We come into the world with a conscience—one which is not, indeed, able in infancy to function in the manner described, but which exists in the infant as potentialities which gradually become actualities as the soul develops.

But consciences differ widely in their content and in the relative perfection of their functioning. The normal conscience, which contains a perfect knowledge of the law and functions exactly as it should, does not exist in men since the fall. The one normal conscience since the fall is that of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. All others are defective in their content and imperfect in their functioning. Consciences being in reality men's moral nature in action differ as men differ from one another. Their individual characteristics are often very marked.

In the consciences of various individuals there is a difference in content. The conscience of the heathen, whose knowledge of the moral law must be gathered from the natural law written in the heart, cannot have the same content as that of the Christian, who possesses the revealed will of God. And the content of the consciences of various individuals among the heathen and among Christians also differ widely. Some have a much clearer apprehension of the right than others who have access to the same law. Responsibility for the knowledge of right and wrong is proportioned to the opportunity and the use of the opportunity for furnishing the conscience with a proper content.

Some men are quick to discern right from wrong, and form their moral judgments with great ability and accuracy, while others are dull and slow in their moral discernment. In some persons conscience delivers its imperative with great firmness and insistence, while in others its urge is weak. What we call a difference in the consciences is in reality a difference located ultimately in the moral personalities of the different men.

Causes of Differences in Consciences. The difference in consciences depends on a number of factors. The first of these is heredity. It is not easy to describe accurately the relation between the moral personality which a man develops and the moral inheritance which has been passed on to him from his ancestors. But certainly there will be agreement on this point, that no two children present exactly the same problem to those who are entrusted with their moral training. There is a difference in the swiftness and accuracy with which they discern right from wrong, a difference in the sensitiveness of their moral feelings, and a difference in the urge of the moral imperative in them.

Another factor is environment with its opportunity for moral enlightenment and training. We do not expect to find the same kind of a sensitive and enlightened conscience in one who was brought up in the midst of unreproved vice as we do in one who was brought up in a Christian home.

Still another factor is the character which the man has formed in himself. By repeatedly deciding rightly or wrongly in moral matters he has formed habits and eventually fashioned his character for good or evil. Character is what the man has come to be in his real self. And since conscience is the self acting in the moral sphere, character forms a large factor in that activity.

Classification of Consciences. Consciences as empirically found among men may be classified in various ways, either on the basis of the correctness or incorrectness of their functioning in the normative sphere, or on the basis of the firmness and inexorableness of their functioning in the imperative and forensic spheres. Some consciences are enlightened and have a clear knowledge of God's law; others are unenlightened, erring and benighted. Some consciences are sensitive, revolting against the least unrighteousness in thought, word or deed; while others are lax and elastic, and permit questionable or wrong actions to pass without any or with very little protest.

Some consciences are scrupulous, keenly observant of and insistent upon the finest discriminations between right and wrong, and descending to the minutiæ of conduct; while others are hardened and indifferent to even gross infractions of the moral law. The scrupulous conscience, while a good thing within proper limits, may become overscrupulous and devote such attention to comparatively trivial details as to divert attention from larger moral issues and seriously to impede the development of the moral life. Of this kind were the consciences of the scribes and Pharisees, who paid tithes of mint and anise and cummin, and omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith. Sometimes also the conscience combines in itself in a remarkable way the elements both of scrupulousness and laxity, so that its possessor, like the Pharisee, strains at a gnat and swallows a camel.

Some men's consciences are elastic as rubber. Such persons persuade themselves that in doing a great many wrong things they are acting with a good conscience. This is due to the fact that they originally framed excuses for wrong actions and continued to do so until at last they have persuaded themselves that wrong is right and that black is white.

Some consciences are healthy; others are morbid and narrow. The healthy conscience manifests a proper repulsion against evil and an unbending insistence upon the doing of the right; but at the same time it does not lose its sense of proportion, ascribes to each thing its proper relative importance, and is concerned not simply with the negative duty of avoiding wrong but with the positive duty of doing the right and developing the ethical life in the fellowship with God. The morbid conscience on the other hand pays undue attention to minor details of conduct, magnifies small offenses into large ones, imagines sin where there is none, and not only makes its possessor extremely miserable in spite of his desperate efforts to do right, but hampers that larger growth of the moral self which ought to take place through the increase in positive virtues and the active service of God. In worrying unduly over small sins, which do indeed need forgiveness but which form only a small part in the whole scheme of life, such persons unfit themselves physically and mentally for the performance of important duties. Though we are to be sorry for even small sins and are to ask forgiveness, we must not magnify them out of all proportion to their real significance, but must maintain a proper moral perspective. If we stumble and fall, we should rise and go on our way determined to be more careful in the future; but we are not to regard ourselves as having fallen over a precipice every time we fall into any sin or are guilty of any oversight.

The narrow conscience is inclined to find the essence of morality in the observance of a particular line of conduct which it has mapped out for itself as correct, and is puritanic and legalistic. It puts down as wrong what many other thoroughly conscientious persons are convinced is not wrong. Its possessor becomes self-righteous, looking for the mote in the other man's eye and overlooking the beam in his own. He is inclined to insist that his conscience shall be the guide and its decisions the norm for other persons' actions, whereas in fact, every man's own conscience must decide what is right or wrong for him to do, and he dare not take another man's conscience as his guide.

Conscience may be active; or it may be asleep and even dead. By persistent neglect it is often put into a state of coma; and this coma may pass over into death. Often, however, the sleeping conscience is at last awakened, and reproves and condemns with the utmost severity. A notable example of the sleeping conscience and its awakening is given by our Lord in the parable of the Prodigal Son.

Conscience may be stupefied or put to sleep by drink or drugs. These stupefy the brain, the organ through which the mind works, and prevent the mind from functioning properly in the moral sphere or in any other.

A dead conscience is rare. It may seem dead, and yet be only asleep. It is dead only when man has reached a diabolical state. It seems reasonable to suppose that the sin against the Holy Ghost and the dead conscience go hand in hand.

The Regenerate Conscience. Since conscience is the activity of the self in the moral sphere, the question as to what the relation of regeneration is to the conscience is essentially the question as to what regeneration does to or for the person. The answer is that regeneration restores certain powers lost by the fall, and that these powers are restored to the intellect, the feelings and the will, through which conscience does its work.

Regeneration does not give to man a new intellect, but it so effectually renews the intellect that it possesses a power of perceiving, knowing and judging in spiritual and moral matters which it utterly lacked before. It had been unable to function within the domain of the truly ethical. But it is now enabled to do so, and it discerns with a power to which it previously was a stranger the difference between right and wrong. It still does not arrive infallibly at correct results in its moral judgments. But as enlightenment by the Holy Spirit increases in the process of sanctification, the number and the degree of its mistakes in moral judgments and the discernment of duty gradually diminish, till in the next world it is so completely enlightened and perfected that it shall make no more mistakes.

Regeneration does not give men new powers of feeling. But it produces such a change in the character of the emotions, that the callousness with regard to the moral and spiritual state which marked the natural man is removed, and is replaced with a deep and abiding aversion to sin and with a fervent love of righteousness.

Regeneration does not give to man a new will. But it removes the inability and perverseness by reason of which man could not and would not will in harmony with God's will, and makes the will truly free. It enables the will to function in that real ethical sphere which finds in the right relation to God its essential factor, and enables and persuades the man to will in harmony with the will of God.

If we bear in mind that conscience, in the regenerate man as well as in the unregenerate man, is not a voice from the outside in which God speaks to him, or a special moral faculty attached to him, but that it is the activity of the self functioning in the moral sphere through the intellect, the sensibility and the will, the question as to the relation of regeneration and renewal to the conscience will be answered. The regenerate conscience is the conscience acting through the renewed intellect, the renewed feelings and the renewed will, and therefore functioning with a truth and accuracy which cannot be the case with the unregenerate conscience. When the Holy Ghost speaks to and through what we call the regenerate conscience, He is really speaking to and through the regenerate man as one who, because of regeneration, thinks and feels and wills in all moral matters as a new man in Christ Jesus.

CHAPTER V

THE EXTERNAL POSITIVE LAW

THE external positive law is of two kinds, human and divine. By the human we mean the law of the State or the community; by the divine we mean the law revealed in the Scriptures.

Human Law. Human law is the more or less adequate expression of the moral consciousness of the community or the nation. It is contained in the laws of the State and the ordinances of the municipality. It is supposed to represent the consensus of the moral judgments of the better elements of society for the regulation of the temporal affairs and relations of men. Its usefulness is twofold: it acts as a restraint upon the wicked, and it protects the rights of the individual and of society. It cannot produce genuine morality, because it deals only with external conduct; but it prevents much crime and maintains by force an outward semblance of morality. It does not profess to deal with thoughts and opinions; if it undertakes to do so, it becomes tyrannical. Its proper function is to deal with overt acts by means of a command or a prohibition.

Human law was deemed by the Greeks to be an indispensable and satisfactory means of moral training. The ideal morality was to be exemplified and produced by the State. For those persons who have no moral guide but the dim light of a much benighted conscience, human law serves a useful purpose in setting up some kind of a moral standard, in educating ethical thought, and in directing the outward moral conduct. But human law has its limitations. It is insufficient as a moral norm because of its fallibility; it is too limited in scope, in that it deals only with the relation of man to his fellow men and not with his relation to God; and it is deficient in its results, because it cannot reach the thoughts and the heart but only the outward conduct, and gives to conduct the stamp of external morality. Christianity distinguishes clearly between the legal and the moral, though it recognizes the usefulness of civil law as a moral discipline.

In a democracy laws are supposed to express the will of the majority. They usually do. But it may happen that some laws are passed because of the insistent pressure of a determined minority upon a legislative body, and hence lack the sympathetic support of the majority of the citizens. In the nature of the case such laws will be difficult and even impossible to enforce. Majorities in legislative bodies decide what the law shall be, and such laws are binding until repealed. But a majority is not always right in its judgments. The fact that public opinion sometimes reverses itself, and that the majority is found now on one side and now on another side of a disputed question shows that the opinion of the majority is not always to be depended on as an infallible index of the right. Neither the legislators themselves nor the voters who elect them are infallible in their judgments. Since laws are or at least ought to be the expression of the public moral sentiment, and they are supposed to be made in response to public opinion, the improvement of laws must be sought through the enlightenment of the public conscience and the quickening of the moral sense of the people.

Divine Law. The positive divine law is the revealed expression of the divine will, and is the absolute norm of morality. It was promulgated through Moses at Mount Sinai. The necessity for its supernatural revelation is found in the obscuration of the natural law in the heart by sin. Without the supernaturally revealed law men could never have known God's will aright. Conscience could not furnish an adequate knowledge of it, because its law had in part become illegible. The positive divine law is legible in all its parts. It is given in definite objective statements. Its possession gives the Christian a great moral advantage over the heathen.

The law revealed through Moses has in it three distinct elements: the moral, the ceremonial, and the forensic. This threefold distinction, though real, is not made in the Books of Moses. For the Jew the law in all three respects constituted a unit. He was bound by all its requirements. For us the ceremonial and forensic elements no longer contain an obligation. The ceremonial law, which enjoined rules for cleansing, sacrifices, festivals, etc., has been fulfilled in Christ to whom it pointed forward, and is now abrogated. The forensic or national law concerned only those persons who lived in the Jewish state. But the moral law is binding and always will be binding upon all men everywhere, because it is based on the moral nature of God and is abiding and unchanging. The essence of that law is love; and love will be the moral norm to all eternity.

The positive divine law is found in the Ten Commandments, and in the Great Commandment of love to God and our fellow men. It is found also in many other places in the Bible, notably the Sermon on the Mount and the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians.

The Ten Commandments contain eleven commands. But as the Bible itself speaks of the commandments as ten (Exod. 34:28; Deut. 4:13), the necessity of numbering them as ten is apparent. We may obtain ten by combining the first and second commands into one commandment, as is done by the Lutheran and the Roman Catholic Churches; or by combining the last two into one, as is done by the Reformed Churches. The method of numbering them is not vital. Yet from the standpoint of convenience, it is a pity that a twofold division prevails in Christendom.

The Third Commandment, addressed as it primarily was to Israel, had in it a ceremonial element which was temporary (Col. 2: 16, 17; Rom. 14 :5, 6; Gal. 4: 10, 11); but it contains a fundamental moral requirement, as shown by Luther in his catechism.

The revealed law is the expression of the will of God in the form of specific demands upon man. It is not a mere repetition of the law in conscience, but is a complete and perfect law. It reveals God as the source of its authority, and demands likeness to Him as the prototype (Lev. 19:2. cf. Matt. 5:48). It presents in an external positive form the ideal which is to be concretely realized by man, and shows him what kind of a person he is to be. It makes sin not only a wrong against ourselves and our fellow men, but against God, who is the Lawgiver, Judge and Rewarder. Its essence is love, and its substance is summed up in the Great Double Commandment of Love (Matt. 22:36-40). It is a unit as the expression of the one will of God, though it makes varied requirements. Whoever breaks one commandment is guilty of all (James 2:10), inasmuch as all the various requirements are simply different applications of one fundamental principle. The breaking of one commandment is the breaking of one link in the chain, and hence of the whole chain; it is a vaulting over one board in the fence, and hence over the whole fence.

The value of the moral law in its external positive form lies in the fact that it is a definite and infallible statement of the ethical norm, free from the subjectivity and uncertainty that pertains to the law of conscience. It is a clear and absolutely reliable declaration of what genuine morality consists in.

As the expression of the divine nature which is Love, the moral law finds its fulfillment in love. The ideal human character is one which is a copy of the divine.

The moral law was not given to restrict and hamper men, and is in no sense an arbitrary enactment, but was given to point out the path of obedience upon which alone true and lasting happiness could be found.

The Threefold Use of the Law. The use of the law is threefold: Political, Elenctico-pedagogical, and Didactic. In its political use the moral law serves as a guide in the framing of human laws. In its elenctico-pedagogical use it shows men their sinfulness, convicts them of guilt, and inclines them to look for salvation to Christ whom the Gospel proclaims. In its didactic use it is a guide for the regenerate man's life.

If man had not fallen into sin, the purpose of the law would have been to enable him to gain the reward of eternal happiness by obedience. But long before the external law was given through Moses, man had become a sinner. And hence the direct purpose of the law was not to save man by it, but to show him his sin and his need of salvation. It is meant to reveal to him the kind of a man he is in God's eyes, so that he may repent and seek forgiveness and salvation in Christ. This is called the elenctico-pedagogical use of the law. As Paul says, the law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ (Gal. 3:24). This purpose of the law is frustrated by those who, like the Pharisees, seek to make the law a means of salvation, and who turn religion into a legalistic observance of certain external requirements. In such cases the appreciation of the genuinely ethical as an inner state is lost in the endeavor to measure morality by the outward letter of the law. In opposition to such a tendency (Matt. 5:20) the New Testament emphasizes the law's requirement of a right disposition of the mind. If men are to be convicted of sin, this cannot be done, in many cases, by simply presenting to them the external demands of the decalogue. They will plead, like the lawyer in the Scripture, that they have kept all these things from their youth up. They can be convicted only by emphasis upon the basic requirement of the law, that they should love the Lord with all their heart and with all their mind and with all their soul and with all their strength, and their neighbor as themselves.

In its didactic use the law points out to the believer the road on which he should travel. It does not produce in the believer the desire to do God's will; that desire is wrought in him by the Holy Ghost in regeneration. But the external law is useful to him in that by its positive directions it points out the right way and enables him to carry out his purpose of traveling upon it.

The political use of the law applies to the wicked; the didactic to the believer. The elenctico-pedagogical use applies first of all to the unbeliever, but also to the believer. In the case of the former it is meant to produce repentance; in the case of the latter it is meant to continue and increase repentance and to prevent the believer from becoming self-righteous or presumptuous. The didactic use is for the Christian only, because he is the only one who really desires to travel on the right way, and the only one therefore who will be benefited by guideposts. It is true, some men who are not Christians desire to travel on the right way externally; but as they do not desire to travel on the road which involves true love to God and man, the law does not serve a didactic purpose for them.

The fulfillment of the law in the sense of doing all that it requires is for man an impossible task. The natural man has neither the desire nor the ability to fulfill it. The Christian has the desire; but even he, in spite of the fact that the law has become the law of his mind, does not have the ability to meet its requirements in full. "To will is present" with him; "but how to perform that which is good" he "finds not." The only way in which the Christian perfectly fulfills the law is through Christ, who has fulfilled it vicariously for him. That fulfillment is counted as belonging to the believer.

Nomism and Antinomianism. Nomism and antinomianism are two extremes in conflict with the Christian attitude toward the law. Nomism is a false bondage to the law, and antinomianism is a false freedom from it.

Nomism finds the essence of the law in the outward command, and hopes to fulfill it by attention to the letter. It parcels the law out into a multitude of rules and precepts, and holds that by scrupulous obedience to them a man can make of himself a good man. It regards the law, not as a unit, with holy love as its unifying principle, but as an aggregation of individual precepts and regulations; not as an ethical ideal to be realized by the free growth of a vital inner principle, but as an ideal to be fashioned into shape from the outside.

The antinomian assumes that what he ought to be is only what he already is, and rejects the authority of the law over him. While the legalist says, "I will never be what I ought to be unless I do and omit all these and those things," the antinomian says, "I already am what I ought to be, and I need no law." But to suppose that the law has been abolished, even for the Christian, is an utter misconception of the true state of affairs. The moral law, as the expression of the immutable will of God, is eternal and cannot be abolished. The Christian, indeed, is not under the law but under grace. He is not under an obligation to fulfill the law in order to be saved; for he is saved by grace without the works of the law. But as a Christian he is one who in a preëminent sense has been changed into an ethical being, and his one great concern is to know God's law and to do it.

Nomism was essentially the Jewish standpoint, and antinomianism the Greek. For the Pharisee the ideal moral personality was the self-righteous man who rigorously observed the minutiæ of the law. For the Greek the ideal moral personality was the wise man who was morally sufficient unto himself. St. Paul combated nomism in his epistles to the Galatians and Colossians, and opposed to it the righteousness of faith; while St. John combated antinomianism, and opposed to it the inner constraint of the law of love (1 John 2:3-8; 3:22-24, etc.). Christianity is neither bondage nor lawlessness, but true freedom, the freedom of those who have become God's children. The Roman Church became nomistic, regarding the Gospel as a new law. The Gnostics of the early centuries and the pantheistic sects of the Middle Ages were antinomian. The true Christian attitude is one that is opposed both to nomism and to antinomianism.

The Roman Catholic Church does not conceive of faith as an operative power working by love, but only as a belief of the Church's teaching, while it conceives of morality as a doing what the Church commands. The Lutheran Church on the other hand, recognizing in faith both a receptive and an operative power, conceives of the moral life as the outgrowth of the love which results from true faith. The Reformed Churches agree in the main with this position of the Lutheran Church, but often manifest a nomistic or legalistic tendency.

In the beginning of her history the Lutheran Church was peculiarly exposed to false charges of antinomianism because of her insistence upon justification by faith alone. Luther was frequently misunderstood and misinterpreted. His insistence that the Christian no longer is under the law meant that the believer no longer needs to fulfill it in order to be saved, but did not mean that the Christian has nothing at all to do with the law. The law remains as a law within the Christian, which he desires to fulfill. A really antinomian party developed, however, among the Reformers through John Agricola.

At a later period, when orthodoxy had degenerated into a dead orthodoxism which was purely intellectual and regarded faith as the belief of certain doctrines, Pietism arose under Spener and Francke as a healthy reaction which sought "to bring the head into the heart." But Pietism soon became nomistic, and laid undue emphasis upon external rules and prohibitions.

CHAPTER VI

THE INNER TRANSFORMATION IN MAN

An Ethical Man Needed. Since a Christian life can be led only by one who has become a Christian, spiritual regeneration stands at the very beginning of the truly moral life. For a Christian is one who has been brought to living faith in Christ as his Savior and thus has become regenerated and saved, and not simply one who has made up his mind to accept Jesus as his ethical teacher and example. The truly ethical life from the Christian point of view is the life of the regenerate man. In order to understand the Christian life it is necessary, therefore, to understand the nature and implications of regeneration. For it is only through an inner transformation in man wrought by divine grace that man is made willing and able to lead the kind of life which he ought.

Since the natural man by reason of his sinful nature is incapable of right love to God, and hence incapable of living in accordance with the requirements of God's holy law of love, he needs to undergo a radical inner change. He must be made over into the right kind of man, so that, having been made what he ought to be, he will do what he ought to do. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." The provision for this inner transformation is made in the redemption which is in Christ Jesus and in the work of the Holy Spirit in applying that redemption to the individual soul.

The Necessity of an Inner Transformation, when viewed from the standpoint of ethics, is found in the contradiction which exists between the ethical ideal and the ethical reality in man. He ought to be both willing and able to do all that God requires; but as a matter of fact in his natural state he is neither willing nor able to do so. This contradiction between the ideal and the real must be removed, if there is to be a truly ethical man and a truly ethical life. And it must be removed not by mere amendment in man's conduct but by a transformation of his mind and heart.

This ethical contradiction cannot be removed on the path of nomism or of antinomianism, but only by a real inner change or transformation. Kant imagined that this inner change could be brought about by acting "only on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law." Schiller thought that it could be brought about by teaching men to admire the beautiful. Modernism imagines that it can be brought about by merely setting Jesus before men as the ethical teacher and example. But according to the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, the only way in which it can be brought about is by regeneration wrought by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel of a crucified and risen Savior. Man must become a new man in Christ, and thus be made willing and able to do freely what God wills. He must be inwardly transformed.

Since religion is the fellowship of man with God, and religion and morality are inseparable, the living of a truly moral life is dependent on the reëstablishment of the fellowship with God which was broken by sin. Man must be brought into a new and right relation with God. It is, therefore, the work of the Holy Spirit to make of man the kind of person with whom God can and will enter into fellowship, and between whom and Himself there can and will exist mutual love and friendship. It is evident that such a fellowship of God with man as he is by nature is impossible, because the natural man is laden with guilt and is under God's wrath, and his heart is filled with enmity and opposition to God. So long as this condition of alienation continues, fellowship between man and God is impossible.

The Reconciliation between God and Man. The change which is needed in the relationship between God and man is described in the Scriptures as a reconciliation. The basis on which that reconciliation is to take place is the mediatorial work of Christ; and the power through which it is to be effected is the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit through the Word of God. The need of reconciliation is implied in the existence of alienation and separation; and the goal of the reconciliation is the establishment of harmony and fellowship between man and God.

Reconciliation implies a change of attitude on the part of two persons who have been estranged from one another, and a mutual regarding of one another with favor. And the purpose of the reconciliation which redemption proposes to establish is to bring about a new attitude of God toward man and a new attitude of man toward God. It is not sufficient that one should be ready to be on friendly terms with the other. Reconciliation and the consequent fellowship between man and God imply mutual good-will, harmony and concord. It is a fellowship of love; and the new mutual attitude of God and man toward one another is one of love. The fellowship is, indeed, established through faith; but its essence is love.

When we say that this reconciliation implies a new attitude of love on God's part, we do not mean to imply that previous to the reconciliation God does not love man. For God loves all men, even the vilest sinners. He has loved all men from eternity and has planned from eternity to send His only Son to save them. But this eternal and universal love of God is a love of pity and compassion. It is a love which would not have that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance and live. On the other hand, the love which lies at the basis of the fellowship between God and man is not a love of compassion, but a love of complacency, a love which looks with delight upon the person loved. This complacent love toward man cannot exist in God unless He sees in man that with which He can be pleased and delighted.

The New Attitude of God toward Man. It is to be borne in mind that in the natural man there is nothing in which God can take pleasure, or which could cause Him to view man with the love of complacency. God cannot look with satisfaction upon a being whose heart is turned away from Him to sin, whose will is set in opposition to His, and whose acts are a perpetual transgression of His law. Evidently, man must undergo such a change as will enable God in looking upon him to say that He is well pleased with him. And since God cannot be pleased with an unrighteous person, but only with a righteous one, man must become righteous. Weak and fallible as he is, he cannot become righteous by any activity of his own; but he can become righteous in God's sight by putting on the righteousness of Christ through faith. What is needed, therefore, is that man should be brought to faith. He must by God's grace become a believer; and then in view of his faith God justifies him; that is, God pronounces him righteous by imputing Christ's righteousness to him. Clothed as he then is with the righteousness of Christ put on by faith, he is one with whom God is well pleased. For God beholds in him one whose guilt is completely washed away with the blood of Christ, and who shines resplendent in the robe of Christ's righteousness. The anger and indignation which God, in the nature of the case, must feel against the impenitent and unbelieving sinner whose guilt is still resting upon him is replaced in the case of the believer with a feeling of satisfaction and loving favor. He counts the believer righteous for Christ's sake and treats him henceforth, so long as he remains a believer, as if his sins had never existed. Thus there is brought about a new attitude of God toward man; and one factor in the reconciliation between them is provided for.

The New Attitude of Man toward God. There is, however, another factor. It is not only necessary for reconciliation and fellowship that God should regard man with favor, but also that man should regard God with favor.

The natural man sees in God nothing in which he takes delight. God is everything that the natural man is not, and God's face is set against everything that the natural man loves and pursues. Evidently, therefore, before man can take any pleasure in God or look upon Him in love, a change must take place either in him or in God. It cannot take place in God; for God can never be anything else than the Good and Holy One, and can never become the kind of a person in whom an impenitent sinner can take delight. But a change can take place in man. By the grace of God he can undergo such an inner transformation as will cause him to hate what he used to love and to take pleasure in what he never took pleasure in before. By the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit he is led to repentance for sin and faith in Christ his Savior. And the production of this repentance and faith involves such a change in his mind, such an inner transformation, that his entire attitude toward God and sin is reversed. He now loves what he once hated, and hates what he once loved. The love of God accepted by faith has produced in him love to God in return; and he now finds nothing in all the universe so worthy of love as God. Thus the new attitude of man toward God is brought about, and the second factor in the reconciliation is provided for.

God and man are now reconciled. God delights in man, and man in God. A loving fellowship is established between them. Man can now live a truly ethical life because he is now a truly ethical being, who in his inner self is in harmony with God.

The Nature of the Inner Transformation. The inner transformation of which we have spoken consists essentially of bringing man to faith. When man has become a believer, the transformation is accomplished and the new relation between him and God is established. The establishment of this new relation is dependent on the mediatorial work of Christ. Without Christ and His redemptive work man would never be justified, and equally without it he would never be brought to love God. But the establishment of this new relation is likewise dependent on the work of the Holy Spirit. For it is only by the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit through the Word that faith, which is the axis on which the fellowship with God revolves, is produced. It is in view of man's faith that God justifies him and views him with favor; and equally it is because man believes that he has been redeemed by Christ, that he loves God and surrenders himself to God's service.

The inner transformation of man here spoken of is so radical and thoroughgoing that the man who has been brought to faith in Christ may properly be called a new creature (2 Cor. 5:17). He is an entirely different kind of man spiritually and ethically from the natural or unbelieving man.

A Change of Mind. Viewed from the psychological standpoint, the inner transformation may fitly be characterized by the Scriptural term *metanoia*, which means a change of mind, but which is so imperfectly and so inadequately translated in our English versions as "repentance." It is a pity that in the English language we are obliged to put up with the use of a word which only by a somewhat elaborate explanation can be made to mean in the minds of the hearers what it is intended to mean by the Holy Scriptures. The popular mind does not read into the English word "repentance" the full meaning of the Greek word *metanoia.* Yet what is required for membership in Christ's kingdom, that is, for the fellowship which that kingdom represents, is not simply a feeling of sorrow for sin but a *metanoia* or change of mind. Christ Himself announced this condition at the very beginning of His ministry, and the condition is of the most far-reaching significance. Membership in the kingdom, in other words, fellowship with God, requires a complete change of mind on man's part. This change of mind or inner transformation is wrought by the Holy Spirit when He brings man to faith.

While man's mind is a unit, we distinguish a threefold mental activity: thinking, feeling and willing. The change wrought by the Holy Spirit is manifest in all the mind's activities.

The intellect of the believer is enlightened. He sees what hitherto He was unable to see. The blind spot in the mind's vision which prevented him from beholding spiritual things, and which made "the things of the spirit of God" appear "foolishness unto him," is removed. He now sees things which he never saw before. Once he was blind, but now he sees. And he sees in a new light all those things which he did previously see. He has gained a new perspective, and beholds things in their true relations and proportions. The things of sense have faded into the background, and the things of God have come into the foreground. The sin which once seemed to be the right thing to pursue is now seen as an evil to be abhorred; and the grace of God, to which he was once indifferent and even hostile, now shines resplendent with heavenly light and glory. A complete change has taken place in all that mental activity which we characterize as the intellect.

No less complete and radical is the change in his sensibilities. His feelings are stirred to repugnance, indignation, shame and abhorrence by things which never stirred him so before, and to admiration, sympathy, satisfaction and love by objects which hitherto had no such power of appeal. What he once loved he now hates, and what he once hated he now loves. The sins in which he once delighted now fill his soul with shame and loathing, and the righteousness which he once despised has now become the object of his most fervent desire.

A striking and decisive change has also taken place in his will. Hitherto his will was set in opposition to God. What the will of God required was something which he neither attempted nor was able to do. But now his will has become truly free and is able to function, in weakness, indeed, and with much imperfection, but nevertheless truly, in that higher and divine sphere in which it had hitherto been impotent. Often, indeed, he discovers with St. Paul, that to will is present with him, but how to perform that which is good he finds not. But in the very citadel of his being he finds himself brought into accord with God and his will harmonized with God's. The law of God, against whose commands his will had been defiantly set, is now enthroned in his heart. He now freely wills what God wills; and, in the measure in which the old evil nature which still clings to him does not prevent him, he actually does what God's law enjoins.

With the change in the will the whole man has been changed, and the transformation is evident in every department of the mind's activity. He has undergone "a change of mind."

A Regeneration. Viewed from the standpoint of the new spiritual life which has been wrought in man, the inner transformation may be called a new birth or regeneration. It is essentially the same inner transformation referred to under the term "a change of mind," but it is regarded from a different point of view. The man in his state of unbelief was spiritually "dead in trespasses and sins." But now he is spiritually alive. Hence we say that he has been born again, and is a new man. He has not lost his personal identity nor undergone any change in the substance of his humanity. But he is a new and different man in the sense that he is a new and different kind of man. Yesterday he was an impenitent man, to-day he is a believer. Yesterday he loved sin, to-day he loves God. If it be said that the term "a new man" is therefore a figure of speech, we reply that, though it be so, it is nevertheless a term which denotes an actual newness in man as real and genuine as anything in the wide world.

Like all life, spiritual life cannot be seen, but its presence may be recognized by its manifestations. We cannot define life, nor see it, nor touch it, nor understand it; but we know that it manifests itself by a certain kind of activity. A dead man and a living man are distinguishable in the natural world. And it is even so in the spiritual world. When a man observes in himself the new spiritual activity, he knows that he has been born again. He cannot analyze or describe all those processes by which a new life has been wrought in him. He cannot explain how a man "can be born again when he is old." He knows that one can hear the sound of the wind, but cannot "tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth," and that "so is every one that is born of the Spirit." The life is there. It has been created by God; and its reality is attested by the reality of the repentance and faith which are there. He is spiritually alive; he has been regenerated or born again.

A Conversion. When viewed from the standpoint of the new direction in which the believing man is facing, the inner transformation may be described as a conversion. Literally this means that he has been turned around. Hitherto his face was toward sin and his back toward God; but now he faces and proceeds in the opposite direction. Perhaps the most striking illustration of what is meant by conversion is found in the transformation which took place in St. Paul. He had been facing away from God and persecuting the Christians with the utmost vehemence; but he suddenly paused in his headlong career, faced about, and became an ardent advocate and unwearied preacher of the religion of Christ.

The three terms, a change of mind, regeneration and conversion cannot be classed as identical concepts, or be defined in the same terms. They represent different conceptions, and hence must be differently defined. But they represent different conceptions of essentially the same thing. They all describe the same inner transformation, but each from a different point of view. A change of mind describes it from the standpoint of the operations of the mind; regeneration describes it from the standpoint of the spiritual life; and conversion describes it from the standpoint of the direction in which man is facing and going.

The Transformation an Ethical One. The inner transformation described above is not a mechanical or a magical one, but an ethical one. In dealing with man, God as the Infinite Person is dealing with a finite person made after His own image. He respects man's personality, and never deals with him as with a brute or a machine. He therefore depends on persuasion and not on force to prevail on man to conform to His will. If in the process which we have described man undergoes an inward transformation, that transformation must be understood as taking place in a way which does no violence to his moral nature, but leaves him all through the process a self-determining being.

The method of persuasion is the only tolerable one between persons, if the relation between them is to remain ethical. And this is the method which God uses. All through his epistles Paul takes the position that those to whom he writes and preaches are to be *persuaded* to believe. He entreats and beseeches them to believe the Gospel and be saved. The faith to which man is to be brought is, indeed, the work of the Holy Spirit in him, and is in no sense the product of any natural powers of man; but at the same time the faith itself is an act, not of God's will, but of man's.

It is an act of free surrender to God's love. There is in the process of regeneration, or of bringing man to faith, a divine working in man which we cannot adequately understand and explain (John 3:8), and which makes regeneration a miracle of divine grace. But it is not a process carried out against man's will by force or necessity, but a process in which God finds man unwilling, and makes the unwilling willing. And while mystery necessarily surrounds the beginnings of the spiritual life, the process involved in its origination is a genuinely ethical one, and the result is a free willing of man in harmony with God.

The Power of the Divine Word. In His work of persuading man to believe, the Holy Spirit works along the lines of the human psychology. He persuades men through the truth; the divine Word is the truth. By means of the truth He enlightens men's intellects, stirs their feelings, and moves their wills.

The Word of God has a power of persuasion such as no merely human word possesses. It is "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and the marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12). It possesses the power both of persuading and of enabling man to believe. Without this enabling power which comes through and with the Word, no man would ever be able to believe in Christ. And the marvel of conversion lies right here, that through the Word the Holy Spirit not only makes the unwilling willing, but the unable able.

This power of the Word is due to the fact that it is God's Word. It is the Holy Spirit who speaks in that Word, and who through human beings as his agents persuades men to believe. It cannot be otherwise than that God's Word, with God Himself behind it and in it, shall have a power of enlightening, convincing, stirring, persuading and enabling men, such as no merely human word can possibly have. In the Word of God there is all the power which an infinite God can put into it. And it must be evident that if this Word of God, this voice of the Infinite One speaking to men, does not succeed in bringing them to faith, there is no hope for them; for then no greater power of persuasion exists in all the universe than that which has already been brought to bear upon them in vain.

Regeneration and Sanctification. The beginning of the fellowship of God and man is found in that inner transformation by which man is brought to repentance for sin and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. When this transformation or regeneration has taken place, man is renewed in the very center of his being. A new life-principle has been implanted in him. Harmony has been established in his inmost self between him and God.

Thus in the center of his being, in the pure ego, the Christian is at one with God, and wills what God wills. But in the surrounding areas of the "empirical Me," in all that the pure ego recognizes as Me and Mine, he is not at one with God through regeneration, but is to become so through sanctification. Gradually and ever increasingly all that the Christian is and has is to be brought into subjection to the principle of love to God, which by divine grace rules in his inner self. All his faculties, powers, endowments, endeavors, activities and possessions are to be brought under the control and direction of the inner principle. This gradual subjection of the whole area of the empirical Me is a long, difficult, and sometimes painful process of sanctification, which involves the denial of the old self, the subduing of the flesh, the crucifixion of the members, and the bringing of every thought and word and deed into ever increasing harmony with the will of God.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN ETHICAL MAN

A New Man in Christ. The result of the ethical transformation which we have described is the regenerate man or the new man in Christ, who because of the inner transformation in him is now able to lead a truly ethical life. Having been made by God into a "good tree," he is able to bring forth and actually does bring forth the "good fruit" of righteous living.

He has become a new man because, through the redemption of Christ and the application of that redemption to his soul by the Holy Spirit, he has been freed from the guilt and the power of sin. What has been objectively provided by Christ's mediatorial work has become man's subjective and personal possession through penitence and faith. He stands in a new relation toward God (justification) and has a new disposition toward God (love). The contradiction which exists in the natural man between the ethical ideal and the ethical reality is removed in principle; and in the course of the succeeding gradual sanctification and renewal is more and more removed in his life. He is now truly free, because he wills that for which he was originally constituted; namely, fellowship with God; and because of this new freedom a truly ethical life has become possible.

The nature of the change by virtue of which he has become a new man may best be characterized as ethical and spiritual. He is a new man, not in the sense that he has received a new ego or a new personal identity; not in the sense that the substance of his being has been changed or that new mental powers have been substituted for the old; but he is a new man in the sense that his mind has been energized on the spiritual side and endowed with new, spiritual abilities. Regeneration is not, in the technical sense of the words, a substantial but an accidental change in man; it is not a change in man's essential constitution but in the quality of his essential constitution. Physically and metaphysically he is the same man he was before; but spiritually he is a new man. While he recognizes the existence within him of an old self and a new self, he is conscious that he is both the one and the other, and that the terms "the old self" and "the new self" are terms which describe the old principle of sin and the new principle of righteousness in him.

As a new man in Christ the Christian has a new attitude toward everything; toward God, toward self and toward the world. God has now become the supreme object of his affection and devotion; self is made subordinate to God; and his fellow men have been placed on the same plane of love with himself.

The Place of Faith in the New Life. Faith is the fundamental mark, *the* mark of the Christian or regenerate man. Every true believer is a regenerate man, and every regenerate man is a true believer. In the very process of becoming a believer man has become a new man. Faith and regeneration go hand in hand.

This faith is a living trust of the contrite heart in Christ as Savior. It is not a mere acceptance of the truth of God's Word, nor even a mere acknowledgment that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Savior of men. He who has true faith says, "Jesus is *my Savior*; Jesus died for *me*: *I* am saved in Him."

This faith is at once a receptive and an operative activity. As receptive, it accepts and appropriates what the grace of God offers in Christ; as operative, it is the vital principle of the new life of the Christian and goes out in love to God and man. These two powers of faith have a profound ethical significance.

As a receptive power, faith lays hold on the promise of God in Christ; in other words, it lays hold on Christ. It relies absolutely on Christ for salvation. As a result of this faith, by which the believer lays hold on Christ, he is justified. This justification, as we have seen, is a fundamental factor in the reconciliation of God and man, and is an essential feature of redemption as an ethical process. It is a vindication of the righteousness of God, because it is a justification on the basis of the complete satisfaction for human sin made by Christ. It is the imputation to the believer of Christ's righteousness, without which the restoration of man to a right relationship with a just God would be impossible. And while justification is a forensic act, and works no change in man himself but merely a change in his relation to God, the restoration of man to a truly ethical state of reëstablished fellowship would be impossible without this change of relation and the new attitude of God toward the believer involved in justification.

As an operative power, or as the vital principle in the regenerate man, faith works through love, and results in newness of life. Man's very faith implies that his will has been brought into harmony with God's. Indeed, in the very act of bringing him to faith the Holy Spirit has brought about that harmony. For faith in its essence is complete surrender to God. It is the surrender of our will not only to His *saving* will in Christ, so that we trust in Christ for salvation; but also to His *ethical* will, so that we desire to be and to do only what God would have us be and do. This operative power is inseparable from all saving faith. No man can truly believe that God out of pure grace and mercy has saved him from his sins, without being moved by God's love to love God in return. True faith is not simply receptive but active. As Luther strikingly says in his preface to Romans, "Faith is a living, active, busy, mighty thing; it is impossible that it should not continually do good. Nor does it ask whether good works are to be done; but before one asks, it has already done them, and is constantly active."

This saving faith, then, which is at once receptive and operative, is the essential mark of the Christian or regenerate man. By it he trusts in Christ for salvation and by it he leads a new life of love to God and man.

The Place of Good Works in the New Life. "Faith without works is dead," says St. James. Such a so-called faith is not faith in any true sense of the term. If the heart has not been so changed by grace that love is enthroned in it, there is no faith present, and hence there has been no regeneration. The believer not only does good works, but he cannot help but do them if his faith is genuine.

Not only are good works found in the regenerate man, but they are found only in him. He is the only man who is able to do them. For the doing of good works there must exist a good man. For the bearing of good fruit there must first exist a good tree. The regenerate man is the only one who is acceptable to God, and hence the only one in whose conduct God does or can take delight. Certainly God cannot take pleasure in anything that is done by a person who at heart is still His enemy. Nothing is really good in God's sight unless it flows from a right state of heart and is done from a right motive. The motive is that which makes the deed good or bad. The substance of God's law is love; and unless our deeds are done in love, they are not good in God's sight, whatever may be said of them from the standpoint of human morality. The regenerate man alone possesses and acts from the love which God's law demands. The fundamental necessity of love in every act that is to be called good is brought out in many passages of Scripture, notably in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians.

The motive in good works is love. The believer does not do them in order to be saved. Not only are his good works still of an imperfect character and therefore insufficient to justify and save him; but he cannot do any good works until after he possesses faith and has been justified and saved through faith. He cannot have that love which prompts the good work until he has the faith from which the love springs. Hence good works have nothing to do with the securing of salvation. We are saved by faith alone. But good works are the believer's tribute of love and gratitude to God for his unspeakable mercy in saving him freely for Christ's sake.

Good works are the outward evidence that we are inwardly in harmony with God and His will. We are not brought into harmony with God by doing good works, as the legalist imagines; but we do them and can do them only *because we are* in harmony with Him. "Good works do not make a good man, but a good man does good works." By faith we have been brought into harmony with God both in our outward legal relation and in our inner state. Thus the good works of the Christian are good works, not as a perfect fulfillment of the divine law, but as works performed by one who by faith stands in the right relation with God. As unbelief with its alienation is the root of all sin, so faith with its outer and inner harmony with God is the root of all good works. "Whatever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23).

By good works we understand, then, those works which are done out of love to God and in obedience to God's commandments. They are good, not in the sense of being perfect; for much of imperfection still clings to the best actions of the Christians: but they are good as the fruits of a faith working by love. In the Roman Catholic view, good works consist in the doing not only of what God commands but also of what the Church commands. These good works are regarded as possessing a meritorious character, and as necessary along with faith for salvation. The Christian is supposed to be able by divine grace to keep God's commandments perfectly. Indeed, he is supposed to be able to do more than God requires and to perform works of supererogation by obedience to the evangelical counsels of perfection; that is, by the monastic vows of poverty, celibacy and obedience to ecclesiastical superiors. As a matter of fact, however, the Christian can never hope in this world to do all that God commands; still less can he do more than God requires.

The Place of Sanctification in the New Life. By sanctification we mean the growth and development of the new spiritual life bestowed in regeneration and manifested in Christian living. It is the increasing holiness of heart and life in the believer resulting from his growth in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord. Where there is no increasing sanctification, there faith is dead or in imminent danger of dying.

The regenerate man becomes more and more sanctified; his life becomes more and more conformed to the Christian ideal. The new life implanted by grace necessarily either grows and develops, or else decays and dies. But this process of gradual sanctification involves a constant inward struggle. The old evil nature remains in the believer alongside of the new nature implanted by grace, and must be combated and subdued. It no longer holds the citadel of man's being. On the contrary, the new nature has become the dominating factor in his life. But there is a constant antagonism and conflict between the two natures, which endures through the whole earthly life (Rom. 7:14; Gal. 5:17), and which is described in the Scriptures as the war of the flesh against the spirit. By the coöperation of his renewed will with the working of the Holy Spirit the believer succeeds more and more in subduing the old evil nature and in bringing himself with all his activities more and more completely into subjection to Christ. In his faith he has made the supreme choice; in his life thereafter it is his constant task to bring all subordinate choices into harmony with it.

Innumerable thoughts, words and deeds must be brought into unison with the inner principle. All the areas of man's being must gradually be brought under its control. This is an arduous and lifelong undertaking. Only gradually is the Christian renewed in every part. But the process of sanctification is continually going on. It is progressive. In mind and conduct the believer is more and more being conformed to the mind and conduct of Christ. The goal he aims at is perfection, perfect likeness to God (Matt. 5:48). While he constantly approaches closer to it, he never reaches that goal in this world. He will be perfectly conformed to the likeness of God only when he is transformed and glorified in the world to come.

The progress which the regenerate man makes in sanctification is dependent on various circumstances. Some persons have much more to contend against in their own nature, because certain evil tendencies or habits have a stronger hold upon them. Some have much more to contend against in their environment, and with the same or greater effort make less progress than others. The rower in the middle of the stream has a much stronger current to overcome in his efforts to move upstream than the rower near the shore. The important point in both cases is that the boat should be headed upstream and the rower be pulling in earnest.

Regeneration and Baptism. The adult is brought to faith and regenerated through the Word of God. The power of the Word to regenerate is declared by Peter, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God" (1 Pet. 1:23). But until the believing man is baptized something is still lacking of that full and complete relation between man and God which God desires. Man is a child of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:26), but he is also to be a child of God by adoption into God's family in holy baptism. The assurance of the Word is to be supplemented and confirmed by the assurance of baptism. The promise of the Word is to be individualized by the sacrament with its promise, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The Holy Spirit brings the adult to faith through the Word, but He completes and seals His work through the baptism of the believing person. If a man's conversion be genuine, he will not despise baptism but will desire and seek it as a divinely ordained means of grace, so that in every sense of the term he may stand in a covenant relation with God and live in the fellowship with Him.

In the case of an adult who is converted, the working of the Holy Spirit through the Word comes first, and that through baptism follows. When, as should be the case, the child is baptized in infancy, the order is reversed; the working of the Holy Ghost in baptism comes first, and the working through the teaching and preaching of the Word follows. The baptized child, as he grows up, is gradually brought through the Word into a conscious state of repentance and faith. In the end he reaches exactly the same state as the adult who first believed and then was baptized. Both are then baptized adult believers.

In the case of the infant God meets with no willful resistance, and can in baptism work His gracious will in the child without the stubborn opposition which He meets with in the case of the adult who needs to be converted. In the latter the willful opposition must first be broken down by the Word, and the man must be brought into a childlike state of pliability in God's hands (Matt. 18:3). And this has been done only when he is made consciously to appreciate the grievousness of sin and the greatness of God's love in Christ.

In the baptized infant we have regeneration and divine sonship fitted to the age of the child; in the adult we have regeneration and divine sonship fitted to the adult's stage of mental development. In both cases we ultimately have the same result if the baptized child grows up to conscious repentance and faith; for both are then in the right relation of fellowship with God, and living in that fellowship.

The Vital and Active Principles of the New Life. Faith is the *vital* principle and love is the *active* principle of the new life of the Christian.

Faith is the surrender to God's love, to do with us as He wills. Involving contrition, as it always does, it repudiates the unethical life of the natural man, and chooses the life of fellowship with God by the personal acceptance of Christ as Savior. It is the thankful acceptance of God's saving and sanctifying love.

Love inevitably follows upon this surrender of faith to God's love. The love of God known and gratefully accepted in Christ produces love in return. "We love Him because he first loved us" (1 John 4:19). Love is produced by the contemplation of that which is regarded as lovable. And the recognition of God involved in faith, a recognition of Him as a God of infinite love and mercy, sets Him before the soul in so lovely and attractive a light that the believer cannot help but love God. Hence faith, which is a living, vital principle, worketh by love, and love becomes the active principle of the new life. That love which the law demanded but could not produce springs up in the believer's heart as the fruit of faith. And henceforth, whatever hindrances may present themselves to the working out of his love in practice, the believer finds himself in the very center of his being actuated by love, and in harmony with God; for God is love.

The Regenerate Man and the Law. Since the believer has been brought into an inner state of harmony with God, his relation to the law is different from that of the unbeliever. To the latter the law is a law outside of him, making demands on pain of punishment. To the believer, on the other hand, the law is a law inside of him, to which his own mind has been made to correspond. He obeys the law, therefore, not in compliance with an outward demand, but in compliance with the inner constraint of love. What the law demands is the very thing which in his inmost self he desires to do. He is therefore free from the law; free not only from the necessity of completely fulfilling it in order to be saved, since he is saved by grace; but free from its outward compulsion, since he is inwardly conformed to it. The law is indeed not abrogated, but stands as the expression of the immutable will of God. The believer, however, is not under the law, but under grace; and he does not come under the law again, unless he falls from grace.

From the standpoint of salvation the believer has settled with the law. He fulfilled all its demands when Christ fulfilled them vicariously for him. But from the ethical standpoint the Christian still needs and desires the law as his guide. The law does not make him desire to do the right; the grace of God has accomplished that purpose in him through regeneration. But because he desires to do God's will, he needs the law so that he may not make any mistake as to what the will of God really is.

The New Law of Freedom. The believer has become free in the highest sense of the word. He possesses the mind or disposition of love toward God which is the fulfillment of the law. Thus for him the commandments of God are not grievous (1 John 5:3); Christ's yoke is easy and His burden light (Matt. 11:30); and the law is the perfect law of liberty (James 1:25; 2:12).

The unbeliever is obliged to fulfill the law and is unable to do so, and hence he is not free. He is free in earthly and civil matters, but not free in the higher ethical sphere. So long as he cannot will what his very constitution as an ethical being requires that he should will, he certainly is not truly free. But the regenerate man possesses the higher and true freedom; for by divine grace he is enabled to will and does will what God wills. Hence for him the law is a law of freedom. He obeys the law not from fear of punishment, but because he desires to obey it. He loves God and has no higher aim than to please Him. The more his love grows, the easier and more delightful the doing of God's will becomes.

The Christian's Ethical Task. The regenerate man has a task set for him which will occupy his whole lifetime upon earth and will call for the exertion of all his God-given powers. That task is, to become in every part of his being what God desires him to be. Made free by God's grace, he is to employ his freedom in a constant effort to bring all his thoughts, words and actions into ever increasing accord with the new inner principle of his being. His goal is God-likeness (Matt. 5:48). For the attainment of this goal the promptings of the Holy Spirit must become the voluntary acts of his own will, and the new self must gain constantly increasing control over the inclinations and habits. The believer is to be dead unto sin but alive unto God (Rom. 6:11). He is to live; yet not he, but Christ is to live in him (Gal. 2:20). His ethical development is to be an unfolding of the new life that has been implanted, a growth from within. And his virtues and good works are to be regarded, not as the "works of the law," but as the "fruits of the Spirit" (Gal. 5:22; Eph. 5:9).

The believer has before him a twofold representation of the ideal which he aims to attain: namely, the law of God, and the example of Christ.

The Law as a Guide. If the Christian in this world were completely renewed by the indwelling Spirit, he would need no external law as a guide. But since here on earth his renewal is never complete, he needs and uses the law as a guide, so that by its aid he may clearly see and repent of the sins which still cling to him, and that he may perfect himself in the positive virtues which should mark the ethical life. The great outlines of the law are so well fixed in his mind, that in most cases no particular effort to learn what is right is needed. But there are constantly occurring temptations, perplexing situations and difficult decisions of duty which render it imperative that he shall carefully scan the guideposts of the law, lest he miss his way.

The law which is the Christian's guide is found not only in the decalogue, but in the meaning of the law as expounded by Christ and His apostles. Christ freed the law of God from the traditions with which the scribes and Pharisees had encumbered it, made clear its real meaning, and showed that it must be fulfilled not only by outward deeds but inwardly in the heart by perfect love to God and man. At the same time, in His own mind and conduct He fulfilled all its requirements and gave us a perfect example of holy living. Thus the Christian life becomes a life lived in obedience to Christ's teachings and in imitation of His example.

The Imitation of Christ. Christ is the Great Teacher; and He instructs by His life as well as by His words. In His life of obedience and suffering even unto death He reveals in all its fullness what is meant by the love of God to man, and also what is meant by the love of man to God and to his fellow men.

We are told to follow Christ as our example (1 Pet. 2:21) and to become like Him. The mind which was in Him is to be in us (Phil. 2:5), and the perfect love to God and man which characterized His every word and deed is to mold and shape our conduct also. We are to seek to grow unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, unto a perfect man (Eph. 4:13), ever approximating His likeness here, assured that in the next world we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is (1 John 3:2).

Our imitation of Christ is, however, not to be a direct copying of the things which He did, nor a doing of what we suppose He would do if He were in our place. As a matter of fact we are not able to do under all circumstances what Christ did or would do. Every person's duty is an individual one, to be determined on the basis of the law, the circumstances of the case, and the individuality of the acting subject. An attempt to do as Christ did would often be both presumptuous and ridiculous on our part. The decisive question is not, What would Christ do under these circumstances? but, What would He have *me* do? Our endowments, knowledge, character, power and the like are not identical with Christ's. Our imitation of Christ, therefore is not to be a slavish imitation of His outward actions, but an imitation of His perfect conformity to His Father's will, as that conformity is illustrated in His life. It should be born in mind that the life of Christ cannot furnish us actual examples of conduct under all circumstances, and that there are relations and experiences of human life into which He did not enter. For instance, His life does not give us an actual example for the conduct of a husband or father or merchant, nor furnish a prototype for regeneration and conversion.

The Means of Grace and the Ethical Development. The development of the ethical life is conditioned on the continued use of the Means of Grace through which the new life has been implanted. In baptism with its gracious covenant the Holy Spirit lays the lasting basis of the fellowship with God. In the Word, written and oral, He brings the revelation of God's grace constantly to bear upon the mind and heart as a regenerating and sanctifying power. In the Lord's Supper He mediates and vitalizes the fellowship of the believers with Christ and with one another. Thus the Means of Grace are the objective condition not only of the genesis but of the preservation and development of the Christian ethical life.

Since the work of sanctification is one which must be accomplished through the coöperation of God's will with ours, we must pray for divine grace and assistance; but we must also diligently use the Means of Grace which God has ordained for the purpose of conveying to us the needed strengthening for our task.

The Word is to be used as a constant reminder of our daily need of repentance and forgiveness, of the readiness of God to forgive us for Christ's sake, and of the strengthening grace of God which is at our disposal for the asking. Those persons who despise the hearing and reading of the Word are despising an indispensable aid for success in the fulfillment of their ethical task. The spiritual life will wither and die if it does not derive nourishment from the divine Word which is the food of the soul. The weakness of the faith and the poverty of the spiritual life of many so-called Christians are directly traceable to their neglect of the Word of God.

The sacraments are to be used also. Baptism is, indeed, to be administered only once; but the promise given to us in baptism is to be applied constantly for the comfort and strengthening of the soul. It assures us that we have been adopted as God's children, admonishes us to live as His children, and comforts us with the assurance that God is our loving heavenly Father, who is ever with us as our Friend and Helper.

The Lord's Supper should be partaken of as often as administered. Its purpose is to strengthen our faith and build up our spiritual life. Properly partaken of, it deepens our repentance, strengthens our assurance of forgiveness, and reënforces our determination to bring all our powers and activities into subjection to the law of Christ.

PART II

THE CHRISTIAN MOTIVE

CHAPTER VIII

THE NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

A Christian Life is a life lived in obedience to the will of God, not by the outward compulsion of the law, but by the inner constraint of love. As a regenerate man the Christian has been restored to fellowship with God through faith; and now perfection of living in this fellowship is the goal which he has voluntarily set for himself, and to which all other goals must be subordinated. In his reconciliation with God through Christ, the law of God has become the law of his own innermost being. And since the substance of that law is love, the Christian's life becomes a life of love to God, and a life of love to other persons and things as determined by his love to God.

The Highest Good. Accordingly, for the Christian the Highest Good or goal is found, objectively considered, in God; and, subjectively considered, in communion or fellowship with God. The ethical life thus becomes a unity, because the ethical significance of all things is measured by their relation to God, and all ethical behavior consists in conformity to His will.

With the partial exception of Plato, the Greek world found the goal of man in himself, and sought to reach it either by the enjoyment of the world or by its negation. But the Scriptures place the goal in God. This is implied in the creation of man in God's image, and finds frequent expression in the Psalms (63:1-3; 42:2; 17:15; 73:25). It is emphasized in many places in the New Testament. God has predestinated us unto Himself (Eph. 1:5), all things are of Him, and through Him, and to Him (Rom. 11:36), and all men are to seek after and find Him (Acts 17:27). Man is to have life by coming to God through Christ (John 14:6), and to find peace in Him (Eph. 2:14), and righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost (Rom. 14:17). The believer's treasure is to be in heaven (Matt. 6:20), and he is not only to seek the kingdom of God before all else (Matt. 6:33), but he is to sacrifice all else, if need be, in order to obtain and retain it. The objection that since Christianity bids us seek the highest blessedness in God, therefore the Highest Good of the Christian has in it an hedonistic element, is not valid; for the Highest Good is here regarded in a strictly ethical sense.

A Radical Difference exists between the life of the Christian and that of the non-Christian, though this fact is not always apparent in the outward conduct. In the early days of the Christian Church the difference between the life of the Christian and that of the pagan was very evident. Their ethical ideals were far apart. Their standards of right and wrong were very unlike. But in our day the influence of Christian ideals has penetrated far beyond the confines of the Church, and has molded the ethical thinking and practice of innumerable persons who make no claim to Christianity and even are hostile to it. To a large extent the standards of Christianity with regard to honesty, truthfulness, decency, generosity, kindness and the like have become the accepted standards of the world in which we live.

There is, nevertheless, a wide difference between the life of the Christian and that of the non-Christian. Both men may be honest, truthful, clean, generous and kind; but the maxim that "if two persons do the same thing, it is not the same" applies here. When examined with regard to their inner nature the lives and conduct of the two present a fundamental difference in kind. In the one case the life and conduct are the outgrowth and fruit of the natural man and his powers, and the result of motives purely of an earthly nature; while in the other case they are the outgrowth and fruit of the spiritual man, and of the new motive of love to God which has followed upon the grateful appreciation and acceptance of God's love by faith. The Christian's life is the life of one who has been reconciled to God in Christ and is united with Him in love; while the non-Christian's life is the life of one who is still alienated from God and at enmity with Him, and hence a life which does not and cannot flow from love to God. The difference in the lives is to be traced back to a radical difference in the persons. The Christian is a new creature in Christ, and the life which he leads is the legitimate sequence of what he is by divine grace. It is the fruit of the new and good tree. It is the result of the activity of the new principle of love which has been enthroned in him. Externally many of his actions resemble those of persons who are not Christians; but when examined with regard to the attitude of mind and the motive back of them, they are entirely different kinds of actions.

There is a certain inevitableness about the life of the Christian. It may be said of him not only that he leads a new life, but that he cannot help but lead it. If he really has true faith in his heart, his faith will by virtue of its operative power inevitably work by love, and produce ethical conduct. A good tree not only should bear good fruit, but in a very real sense cannot bear any other. Trees and men necessarily bear fruit after their kind. As little as a good tree can fail to bear good fruit, so little can the Christian fail to lead a good life. The very genuineness of his faith guarantees that. The new life of obedience to God can cease only when the man has ceased to be a Christian.

In conformity with the intimate relation between morality and religion, the moral life of the Christian is due to his new spiritual life. When we speak, therefore, of ethical growth or development, the connection between it and the spiritual life of which it is the result and manifestation must not be lost sight of. The growth in right ethical living is contingent upon the growth and development of the new spiritual life out of which it springs. And any attempt to understand the process by which the ethical development expands must go back to the growing and expanding spiritual life.

Spiritual Growth. The new life implanted in its beginnings by regeneration is, like all life, meant to grow and develop; and, as it does so, its activity exhibits increasingly genuine ethical phenomena. In a true sense the Christian has no power in himself to make himself grow either physically or spiritually. Life and its growth are the work of God. Man can do nothing to make himself grow. "Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?" applies to spiritual as well as to physical growth. We speak, indeed, of the coöperation of man with divine grace in his ethical development. But this coöperation is not to be regarded as that of two equals. It is the feeble coöperation of man with the mighty grace of God. The coöperation of the human will with the divine can have no effect upon the life process itself. That is entirely in God's hands. But human coöperation can and should do much to remove the things that would prove obstacles to growth, and to perform those things which according to the divine arrangement are calculated to foster growth. Hence the ethical problem of the Christian is that of removing and overcoming the conditions which are detrimental and promoting those which are favorable to the spiritual life and its ethical fruitage. Among the latter, nourishment on the Word of God occupies the first place.

The Law in the Flesh. The Christian finds in himself and in the world around him much that is calculated to hamper and hinder the true development of his spiritual life. For around him is the world with its snares and temptations, and within him is the old evil nature of sin, which has not been eradicated by regeneration, but which remains in him alongside of the new nature implanted by grace. Hence, while in the center of his being he has been so transformed that his deepest desire is to do only God's will, he finds a law in his flesh which wars against the law of his mind, so that the good which he would he does not, and the evil which he would not, that he does (Rom. 7:19-23). This war of the flesh against the spirit will continue to the end of his life. And it is this conflict which complicates his ethical task, and makes difficult and often futile his best ethical endeavors. To will is present with him, but how to perform that which is good he finds not. Hence his ethical achievements always fall short of his ideals. He finds himself weak in this conflict. But God's grace is sufficient for us (1 Cor. 12:9); and by the continued working of the Holy Spirit in the heart accompanied by the coöperation of the Christian's own will there is a constant, though often slow, growth in the subordination of the psychical and physical nature to the law of God which reigns in the citadel of the Christian's being.

Love as the Motive. Christianity is fundamentally a way of life, not merely a way of living; it is a way of so remaking men in their inmost selves that they become spiritually alive through faith in Christ, and that their behavior becomes ethical as the result of the new inner motive of love. Hence, the development of the Christian's life is by a process of internal spiritual growth, and not by one of external accretion. It grows as a tree grows by the expansion of an inner vital principle, and not as a house "grows" by outward additions. With the increase of faith and love there is a more abundant life (John 10:10), and this abounding life manifests itself in an ever enlarging ethical activity.

Christian morality is thus not primarily a matter of actions and conduct, though it includes them, but the presence of love to God in us as a power and influence which increasingly controls and directs our thinking, feeling and willing. This love results from God's love to us apprehended by faith (1 John 4:19). It is an appreciative and grateful love. It disposes us, because of God's great love to us, to devote every power and faculty of our being to the doing of His will alone. It is evident that this love cannot be found in any heart in which faith does not abide; and that, on the other hand, it is always present where faith is present, because faith is the loving appreciation of God's love. In its beginnings love is often weak, because faith is weak. It grows through the growth of the faith from which it springs. The more we by faith appreciate God's love to us, the more we love Him in return. If the motive power of love in the Christian's life grows weak, the remedy is to be found in a deeper appreciation of his own sinfulness and of God's love in saving him from it. Love to God does not grow in response to mere exhortations to love, nor yet in response to upbraidings for lack of love. It increases as the believing appreciation of God's love increases; in other words, it increases as faith increases. And when love grows cold we need to pray not only, "Lord increase our love," but, "Lord, increase our faith."

At the same time it must be borne in mind that the power of love to control our lives increases with each new act of love. Exercise gives strength and facility. He who lets love dominate his thoughts and words and deeds will find that it becomes constantly easier to do so. On the other hand, he who withholds the thought or word or deed of love in one instance will find that he has thereby made it more difficult to yield to the impulse of love in other instances.

A Christlike Mind. Since the ethical life which is the outgrowth and development of the new spiritual life implanted in regeneration includes not only the outward conduct but the mind of the Christian, and since only to the extent to which his mind has become pervaded and controlled by the new law of love can the outward conduct possess a truly ethical character, the first task of the Christian is to cultivate a Christlike mind, to become like Christ in his love to God and man. He is to bring his mind into subjection to the law of Christ, so that all his thoughts, desires, aspirations and strivings shall be such only as have their source in a loving desire to do God's will. Outward actions are in themselves neither good nor bad, but possess their distinctive moral or immoral character from the mind or intention from which they have sprung. The Christlike mind is the prerequisite of Christlike conduct. A right disposition is essential for the fulfillment of duty.

When love to God has come to dominate our attitude toward all things, so that the attitude or disposition of love becomes habitual, then love has become a virtue in us. For virtue is the determined and habitual choice of the good. It is the constant and habitual effort to conform in all things to the will of God. And it is the existence of this virtue in a man that fits him for the continued doing of what is morally good.

Virtue a Unit. Since the Christlike mind or disposition is one of love, and whatever is right and ethical in God's sight must spring from love, love is the primary and fundamental virtue. It includes in itself all the other Christian virtues. The others are simply the unfolding of the one great and comprehensive virtue of Christian love. They are the different forms in which the one great virtue manifests itself under the various conditions and circumstances of life. Love is the gem; but it has many facets. One is humility, another is patience, another is gratitude, another is obedience, and so on. The particular facet that is exposed to view depends on the nature of the particular demand made on love. If the demand is made by want, love manifests itself as benevolence; if by an affront or injury, as forbearance and forgiveness. All the virtues grow out of love to God and man.

Faith, Hope and Love. In the ancient Church it was customary, on the basis of 1 Cor. 13:13, to regard faith, hope and love as the theological virtues. This view was shared by the Middle Ages. It is still the prevalent view in the Roman Catholic Church, which in its doctrine of *fides informis* and *fides caritate formata* gives to love a place above faith.

But faith, hope and love are not really coördinate virtues.

There is an essential difference between faith on the one hand, and love and hope on the other. Faith stands in a class by itself and, strictly speaking, is not a virtue but the source of the virtues. Faith is the prerequisite and essential condition for all virtues. Through faith there comes into existence between God and man that relation which alone makes love or hope or any other Christian virtues possible. To faith there belongs a certain preëminence over love and hope, inasmuch as faith is the originating and vital principle, while love and hope result from it. Love is, indeed, the essence of the Christian ethical disposition; but faith is its prerequisite.

The whole relation of fellowship with God is based on faith. This is true in the Old Testament dispensation as well as in the New. The greatness of Abraham as a man of God consisted in his faith. The disciples first believed on Christ and followed Him; and then they loved Him and based their hope on Him. Thus faith is not a virtue to be placed alongside of other virtues, but rather is to be placed before all virtues as the vital principle of the ethical life. As Luther in commenting on Gal. 5:6 points out, Paul does not say that love works, but that faith works; and he makes love the instrument through which faith operates. All works are acceptable only because of the faith which is in all the works, however different they may be. Hence faith is not a virtue but the mother of the virtues.

Faith, love and hope are so intimately connected, that one cannot be present in the heart without the others. The three together constitute the unity and completeness of the Christian life (1 Cor. 13:13). These three abide; they are the permanent factors in the Christian's life, in contrast to the special gifts which the Corinthians coveted (1 Cor. 12).

And the greatest of these is love, because love is that which makes us to be like God: for God is love.

Faith comes first; and through faith we attain to love and hope. Faith enables us to overcome the world (1 John 5:4); love enables us to minister to it; and hope enables us to renounce it. Faith will give way to sight; hope to glad fruition; but love will abide throughout eternity. So far as salvation is concerned faith is the essential thing. We are saved through faith, not through love. But the final purpose of God is to bring us through faith to love, and eventually to perfect love. Faith is the means, love is the end. Love is the true regulative principle in the relation between man and God and between man and his fellows, and shall remain so forever.

CHAPTER IX

LOVE TO GOD

The Fundamental Virtue. The love which controls the Christian's mind or heart, and which is the fundamental virtue out of which all others spring, is primarily love to God; for the ethical relation is first of all and essentially a relation to Him. The fellowship between the believer and God established through faith is a fellowship of mutual love —a love of complacency on God's part toward the believer for Christ's sake, and a grateful love of the believer for God. The nature of this mutual love is more fully characterized by the Biblical description of the relationship between God and the believer as that of Father and child; for we are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:26). The love which the Christian has to God is therefore a filial love; a love which is confident of God's love and care, and which in a childlike spirit seeks to do only that which is pleasing to God. It is the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father, in contrast to the spirit of bondage which obeys from fear (Rom. 8:15). To the extent to which the love of God becomes perfect, slavish fear of God disappears; for perfect love casteth out fear (1 John 4:18). The Christian will always have a childlike fear of God; but it is a fear of displeasing God and of losing Him, rather than a fear of punishment.

A Unifying Principle. Love, in the proper sense of the word, is possible only between persons, and is the essence of personal fellowship. It not only manifests itself in a tender mutual consideration, but implies a love for the same things and a striving for the same ends. It is therefore a unifying principle. Hence, love to God results in the harmony of the Christian's will with God's and in the making of God's purposes his. It implies a love for the persons and things which God loves, and a hatred of that which He hates. It is a love which is to hold the highest place in the heart; for we are to love God with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our strength, and with all our mind (Luke 10:27). This love does not exclude love for other persons and things, but requires its subordination to the love of God. He who loves God is expressly commanded to love his brother also (1 John 4:21). Love to God has as its corollary love to the neighbor; for while God hates sin, He loves the sinner and seeks the salvation of the sinner even at the cost of the sacrifice of His only Son. Hence the command to love God above all is accompanied by the other which is like unto it, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Love to God cannot exist without love to our fellow men. For if a man says that he loves God and yet hates his brother, the apostle declares that the man is a liar (1 John 4:20).

The Result of God's Love. Love to God is the result of His love to us (1 John 4:19). It flows from our appreciation of all that God is and all that He has done and does for us in temporal and spiritual things. For in spite of our unworthiness, His mercies are new unto us every morning (Lam. 3:22, 23), and He bestows upon us unspeakable grace and mercy through the redemptive work of Christ and the regenerating and sanctifying operations of the Holy Spirit. Our love to God is therefore a grateful love. It is, indeed, a disinterested love in the sense that we do not love

Him in order to earn salvation by so doing. It is a love of gratitude for salvation already freely received. But this disinterestedness is not to be understood as meaning that it leaves out of consideration all the temporal and spiritual benefits which we have received from God. The Christian will never in this world or the next forget the divine grace which saved him in Christ, nor fail to be moved by its contemplation. The more he meditates upon God's love and what it means to him, the greater his love to God becomes.

Love is commanded in the law; but it is not produced by a command. It is the result of seeing and appreciating what we regard as lovable qualities in another. Here is the fundamental reason for the insufficiency of the law. It is indispensable in its place, to convict of sin and of the need of grace. But its demand for love is unaccompanied by the bestowal of any power to do what is demanded. Love to God grows by the contemplation of His love to us and of His perfect character. When the Christian's life is not what it should be, we trace the defect back to the lack of love to God, and this again to the lack of sufficient appreciation of God's love to us. In the hurry and rush of business and amusement Christians often take too little time for meditation upon God's love and what it means for them, and hence their love fails to increase and grow strong.

Virtues Comprehended in Love to God. Love to God is the active principle of the whole ethical life. Out of it all virtues must develop, and by it all conduct must be regulated. So fundamentally does it constitute Christian character that all other virtues may properly be regarded as forms in which love to God manifests itself.

It is difficult to frame a satisfactory list of all the Christian virtues. The New Testament mentions a large number of them (Gal. 5:22; Eph. 5:9; 2 Pet. 1:5-7; 1 Cor. 13); but it does not attempt to classify them. Probably the best way in which to enumerate and classify them is to regard them with respect to the person or object directly involved in the virtue. We thus obtain four classes of virtues: with respect to God, self, our fellow men, and the world in general. In this chapter we shall confine ourselves to a consideration of the virtues which flow directly from love to God, and which have immediate reference to our relation to Him.

Love to God manifests itself in various ways. As a response to God's love to the unworthy, love to God manifests itself in Humility; as a loving appreciation of God's kindness, in Thankfulness; as a loving desire to please God, in Obedience; as an enduring love, in Fidelity; as a confiding love, in Trust; as a rejoicing love, in Joy; and as a loving confidence with respect to the future, in Hope.

Humility, which is so essential a constituent of Christian character, is a virtue for which the Greeks had not even a name. It was a conception foreign to their minds, and hence they had no word to describe it. For them the exemplary man was the man of magnanimous pride. The use of the term *tapeinophrosune* in the sense of humility is confined to the New Testament Greek. Josephus employs it in the sense of pusillanimity. By the classic writers the word *tapeinos*, which in the New Testament means humble or lowly, was used as a term of contempt, and when applied to persons meant mean or base. For the Greeks the antithesis of pride or arrogance was *sophrosune* (temperance or sobriety); and in their daily intercourse with other men, *dikaiosune* (justice or righteousness). The mental attitude commended by the Stoic was that of haughty self-sufficiency and of proud resignation to the inevitable. Christianity, however, has assigned to humility a place among the essential virtues. Without humility no one can become or remain a Christian.

The requirement of humility runs counter to the natural inclination of the human heart. This is true not only in man's relation to his fellow men where his natural tendency is to seek to be honored and served, but is especially true in his relation to God. One of the greatest obstacles which the Gospel meets in the natural man is his deep-rooted unwillingness to acknowledge his utter unworthiness and spiritual helplessness. And yet until man acknowledges his complete dependence upon divine grace, no faith in Christ is possible. Hence the necessity of humility is emphasized throughout the New Testament; and Christ, who in His own person had no such reason for humility as we have, nevertheless gave us an example of humility. He lived among men in all lowliness, and humbled Himself even unto death in order to redeem us (Phil. 2:6-8). As a man He completely subordinated His own will to that of His heavenly Father (John 4:34).

The necessity of humility in any right attitude toward God appears from the contrast between the omnipotence of God and the weakness of man, between the holiness of God and the sinfulness of man, between the righteousness of God and the guilt and helplessness of man. A true appreciation of the situation produced by sin leaves to man no alternative but to smite upon his breast and say, "God be merciful to me the sinner" (Luke 18:13). God resists the proud but gives grace to the humble (1 Peter 5:5). Since the Christian is one who has found grace, he is one who in the very process of being brought to faith has become humble in mind. And this humility remains ever afterwards a basic factor in his character. He realizes that nothing of what he is or does in conformity with God's will is due to any strength or merit in him, but solely to divine grace. And the development of his Christian character depends on the constant presence of humility as a basic ingredient. He is constantly dependent on God for the grace and strength which he needs, and constantly ascribes to God and not to himself the credit for any worthy Christian achievement. His strength is found in his humble dependence on God (2 Cor. 12:9, 10). By God's grace he is what he is (1 Cor. 15:10). His Christian ethical development will be directly in proportion to the presence of humility; for God dwells with him who is of a humble and contrite heart (Isa. 57:15). Without humility on our part God can neither carry out His gracious purposes within us, nor satisfactorily use us for the accomplishment of His purposes in His kingdom.

Thankfulness to God is the loving appreciation of His goodness. Since only the believer can or does love God, only the believer can or will be really thankful to Him. Worldly men, being estranged from God by sin, have no inclination to acknowledge their indebtedness to Him. Their very impenitence and unbelief are an evidence of ingratitude. God does, indeed, let His sun shine on the evil and on the good, and send rain upon the just and the unjust (Matt. 5:45); but true gratitude for temporal blessings as well as for the spiritual riches offered in Christ is absent from the unbeliever's heart. The lack of gratitude to God is designated by the apostle Paul as a fundamental sin of heathendom (Rom. 1:21). It is one of the outstanding sins of mankind to-day.

The Christian is thankful to God, because he realizes that every good gift of body or soul comes from God (Jas. 1:17), and his faith and love prompt him to receive those gifts with thanksgiving. The temporal blessings which call for gratitude are enumerated by Luther in his explanation of the first article of the Creed in his Small Catechism, in which he describes God's creation and providence. The spiritual blessings which call for gratitude are described in his explanation of the second and third articles, in which he gives in large outlines the divine work of redemption and sanctification. The Heidelberg Catechism treats of the Christian's entire obedience to the commandments of God under the head of thankfulness. For the believer the fact that divine grace has rescued him from sin and destruction is ceaseless cause for gratitude. He leads a new life in harmony with God's will, not in the hope of thereby gaining merit, but in loving gratitude for mercies received.

A study of the Scriptures shows that thankfulness has been a marked characteristic of the godly in every age. The Israelites brought thank-offerings to the Lord. Job praised God in the midst of his afflictions (Job 1:21). The Psalms are permeated with the spirit of thankfulness, and abound with expressions of thanksgiving. In the New Testament Paul not only exhorts the Christians to give thanks to God for all things (Eph. 5:20), but glories in afflictions (Rom. 5:3), and sings songs with Silas while confined in the stocks (Acts 16:24, 25). The apostles begin nearly all their epistles with thanksgiving, and break out into thanks in the course of them. Christ himself has given us an example of thankfulness, giving thanks at the breaking of bread, at the institution of the Lord's Supper, and on numerous other occasions. The record of the ten lepers who were cleansed by

Him shows that He looks for gratitude from those who have tasted of His mercy (Luke 17:17).

Christians offer no propitiatory sacrifices to God, because Christ has once for all offered the all-sufficient sacrifice for sin. But they offer the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving. Their whole life is to be a thank-offering to God (Rom. 12:1). It is such a thank-offering in the proportion in which they really appreciate the blessings which God bestows upon them. Unfortunately the very ceaselessness of God's blessings has a tendency to dull the sense of gratitude and to cause men to receive His gifts as a matter of course. Then, too, the mind is often permitted to dwell unduly on the supposed benefits which are lacking, and thus gratitude is diminished for the countless blessings actually received. An increasingly grateful disposition develops in the measure in which the believer daily calls to mind God's benefits and meditates upon God's unfailing goodness. As a virtue gratitude is a matter of the heart, and manifests itself in prayers and hymns and in a godly life of obedience and service.

Obedience. Love to God manifests itself by the increasing development of an obedient mind. Without obedience to God's will all protestations of love to him are futile. Worship which is not accompanied by obedience is unavailing. "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (1 Sam. 15:22). Love is concerned to please the person who is loved. And the absence of obedience to God is evidence of the lack of love for Him. This obedience is a matter of the heart. It is a loving attitude of willing obedience. It is not a compliance with the divine will through the constraint of fear, nor mere external obedience to laws and regulations. It is a fulfillment of the law of God from the motive which the law itself demands, namely, love. For love is the fulfillment of the law (Rom. 13:10). The externality and hollowness of the obedience of the Pharisees was due to their lack of love to God (John 5:42).

Christian obedience is the loving subjection of the human will to the divine. It is the sinking of our will in God's and the disposing of the mind to unqualified compliance with every divine requirement. It implies a mind which not only obeys but which is constantly ready for obedience. It is at once active and passive in its nature—a readiness to do all that God commands and a readiness to endure all things for His sake. Self and its preferences are set aside in a voluntary and loving desire to conform in all things to the divine will. In a child of God who is filled with filial love for his heavenly Father there is always a ready and willing mind. Filial love and obedience go hand in hand. Love increasingly makes obedience easy. To those who love God obedience is not a hardship but a delight (1 John 5:3). Hence Christ's yoke is easy and His burden is light (Matt. 11:28). Unwillingness to obey argues a lack of love to God.

The life of Christ was a life of willing and loving obedience to His heavenly Father. He came into the world to do His Father's will (Heb. 10:7); He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Phil. 2:8); His life-work was to do His Father's will (John 4:34; 6:38); and He saved men by His obedience (Rom. 5:19). The lives of the apostles illustrate the Christian spirit of obedience. They gave themselves with willing minds to the service of Christ and His Gospel, and performed prodigies of labor and endured untold hardships in obeying the command to preach the Gospel to all nations. Paul tells us that he counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ his Lord, and enumerates a formidable list of the hardships which he endured in the propagation of the Gospel (2 Cor. 11:23-28).

The Christian's cultivation of the spirit of obedience meets with much opposition from the remnants of the old nature in him. Love prompts to obedience; the old Adam prompts to disobedience. But the spirit of obedience becomes increasingly the controlling attitude of the mind, as sin by divine grace is more and more subdued in us. The believer aims at perfect obedience to the will of God (Matt. 5:48). This is an ideal which he never reaches in this world, but one which he more and more approaches.

Fidelity is the attitude of the Christian's mind which refuses to let anything separate him from God who is the object of his faith and love, and which disposes him rather to lose all else than to lose Christ (Phil. 3:8). This fidelity is essentially perseverance in faith and love. Without perseverance in the faith the Christian will lose his salvation (Matt. 10:22; Rev. 2:10). Without perseverance in love he cannot remain in the fellowship with God into which he has been received. Fidelity is a resolute clinging to God as the highest good in spite of temptations, difficulties, dangers, persecutions and afflictions. It recognizes that in God lies all our salvation and all our blessedness; and it is not only determined to let no willful sin come between the soul and God, but faithfully and in love to perform every task which Christian duty imposes. It ardently desires to hear from Christ at the end of life the welcome words, "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord" (Matt. 25:21); but it also desires during the whole of life upon earth to have the "testimony of a good conscience and the assurance of God's favor."

The need of fidelity is found in the necessity of overcoming temptations and enduring trials, and in the duty of employing our Christian liberty in the loving and devoted service of God. Its necessity for ethical growth is evident. For the Christian must not only continue in Christ's word if he would be His disciple indeed (John 8:31), but he must abide in Christ as the branch in the vine if he would bear fruit (John 15:4).

Fidelity to God carries with it fidelity in all the relations of life, because all the obligations which we owe to ourselves and to other men are indirectly obligations to God. To be true to Him means to be true to ourselves and to our neighbors, and faithful to duty under all circumstances. Fidelity to the creature which is not consistent with fidelity to God is a sin.

Trust. The believer's trust in God is based on the fact that God spared not His only Son but delivered Him up for us all; and that, having given us this greatest gift, He will not withhold any lesser ones that are needed (Rom. 8:32). The believer is sure of God's love in Christ, and hence places himself unreservedly in God's hands with the confidence that God will watch over him with all a Father's love and care (Ps. 103:13). This trust is essentially a trust in God's special providence over the godly, and hence a firm assurance that God will provide for all our needs (Ps. 55:22), and make all things work together for our good (Rom. 8:28). It is a casting of all our care upon God, because He careth for us (1 Pet. 5:7). Confidence in God's loving care is to be distinguished, however, from foolhardiness and presumption (Matt. 4:7).

This trust is implicit like that of a child in his father (Matt. 6:9; Ps. 103:13). It accepts what befalls as an expression of a loving Father's will (Job 1:21). It relies on

God in every danger (Ps. 31:1), and endures patiently whatever trials He sees fit to send (Col. 1:11). It gives inward peace, no matter how dark and mysterious may be the ways through which Providence leads (John 14:1; Ps. 23:4). It frees from anxiety as to what we shall eat or drink or wear (Matt. 6:25-31), and gives confidence that, if we do our duty from day to day, God will provide for us (Matt. 6:33), and will guard us (Matt. 10:29, 30).

Trust assumes that God is ordering our lives for the best (Rom. 8:28), and gives contentment (Phil. 4:11). It gives patience and even cheerfulness under trials and sufferings, knowing that these are part of the process necessary and intended to refine us for our eternal home (Heb. 12:11). It believes that with every trial God will give the strength needed to bear it (1 Cor. 10:13; 2 Cor. 12:8, 9), and that He will remove it in His own good time (Ps. 130:5, 6). It looks forward to the time when all the sorrows of earth shall be gone forever (Rev. 21:4), and the believer shall enjoy the unalloyed and eternal blessedness of heaven (Rev. 22:2-5).

Joy. The New Testament testifies in many passages to the depth and incomparableness of the joy and blessedness belonging to the Christian. It is an unspeakable joy (1 Pet. 1:8) and a joy in the Holy Ghost (Rom. 14:17). It flows from the consciousness that God loves him, and that he loves God in return. It is of the same kind as the joy of Christ, which was grounded in the knowledge that the Father loved Him, and that He abode in the Father's love by loving the Father and doing His will (John 15:9-11).

The true Christian disposition is, therefore, not one of gloom or solemnity, but of rejoicing in the Lord always (Phil. 4:4). The believer is or should be the happiest of men. His joy is rooted in his peace with God through Jesus Christ (Rom. 5:1), and is conditioned upon the fullness of his communion or fellowship with God. It is necessarily interrupted in this world, but will be perfected in the next. It is not always present in the Christian in the degree in which it ought to be. Our faith gives us a right to rejoice and be glad in the Lord; but we do not always use our right as we should. Like all virtues, our joy in the Lord needs cultivation.

Joy is the fundamental tone that should run through the whole life of the Christian. It should be constant (Phil. 4:4); it should make God's service delightful (1 John 5:3); and it should enable the believer to bear earthly losses and privations with equanimity (Phil. 3:8). Its possession will make us cheerful even in tribulation, because these cannot separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:35-38), and because eternal life and blessedness await us in heaven (Rom. 8:18).

Hope is the patient expectation of a future good. Faith refers to the present, hope to the future. By faith the believer is confident that he is now reconciled to God and enjoys His favor. By hope he is confident that God will in the future bestow upon him every needful gift in this world, and grant him eternal blessedness in the world to come.

This hope is founded on Christ (1 Tim. 1:1) and is wrought in us by God's grace through the resurrection of Christ (1 Pet. 1:3). It is a hope bound up with the Gospel, and is not possessed by those who are still estranged from God (Eph. 2:12). It is the hope of Christ's blessed appearance (Tit. 2:13), of being heirs of eternal life (Tit. 3:7), and of obtaining an eternal and incorruptible inheritance

(1 Pet. 1:3, 4). It is meant to be an anchor of the soul to prevent spiritual shipwreck in times of storm and stress (Heb. 6:18, 19).

Hopefulness is and should be a marked characteristic of the Christian. He waits upon God and hopes in His word (Ps. 130:5). He does not give way to despair. He knows that God is overruling all for the best. In the strength of this hope he takes up his cross daily and follows Jesus, knowing that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in him (Rom. 8:17). His hope gives him courage, patience and endurance, and enables him to be faithful and to receive the crown (Rev. 2:10).

CHAPTER X

LOVE TO OURSELVES

Implied in Command to Love Our Neighbor. Love to self is not expressly commanded in the decalogue or in the summary of the moral law which enjoins love to God and the neighbor. Doubtless the absence of such a command is due to the lack of need for it. Men love themselves of their own accord. The danger is not that they will not love themselves, but that they will love themselves inordinately and in such a manner as to conflict with their love to God and their fellow men. Hence, while it is implied in the moral law that love to self is right, proper and necessary, it is directly stated that it must be exercised in harmony with the love due to God and the neighbor. We are to love God with all our heart, and mind, and soul, and our neighbor as ourselves. The essence of sin is found in selfishness, that is, in loving self wrongly and overmuch. Man's natural tendency is to set the love of self first, and this, of course, is utterly wrong. But there is a proper love of self. It is found where love of self is subordinated to love to God, and where God's will and not our own shapes our lives. Love to God must reign supreme in the heart; and love to self has as its true goal the bringing of self up to the ideal which God has set for it. The Christian loves himself as he should when his aim is to make of himself physically, mentally and spiritually what God desires him to be. This involves the development of body, mind and soul to the highest possible point of efficiency in the service of God.

Preservation of Fellowship with God. The care of the soul on its spiritual side must be the Christian's chief concern in his love for himself. His aim should be above all else to preserve himself in the fellowship with God into which he has been introduced through faith in Christ. Whatever else may befall him, his fundamental concern should be to remain at one with God, and to guard with all his powers against anything which would separate him from the love of God. In guarding this divine fellowship true love for himself will prompt him to take into consideration his entire being as a psycho-physical organism, and to bear in mind that he is not only to be transformed by the renewing of his mind, but that his body also is to be presented as a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God (Rom. 12:1).

Virtues Needed. In order that the Christian may exercise proper care for his body and soul and preserve himself in the fellowship with God, there are certain virtues which he will need to cultivate. Among these are wisdom, vigilance, courage and temperance.

Wisdom. The Christian needs wisdom that he may know what he ought to do and may do it in all the difficult and puzzling situations of life. This wisdom is not mere knowledge. Knowledge may exist without wisdom, and often does. A learned man may be a fool in spite of his learning. Wisdom means both the knowledge and the use of the best means to attain the best ends. Without a large measure of wisdom the Christian will fail of that real care for his soul which he ought to exercise. In its Christian sense wisdom is not simply a virtue of the intellect, but also of the sensibilities and the will. It includes not only the knowledge of the highest good, but love for it, and a determined will to seek it. Its importance is evident. Hence we are to be wise unto salvation (2 Tim. 3:15), and to gain increasing wisdom through prayer (James 1:5) and the study of the Word (2 Pet. 1:19; 2 Tim. 3:16, 17). This wisdom involves a clear knowledge of right from wrong and of the influences at work to destroy us, and also a knowledge and use of the best means to overcome the powers of evil and to gain the victory (Eph. 6:10-18).

Vigilance. The Christian needs vigilance. He must be on his guard against harmful influences and habits of every kind and especially against the temptations with which the flesh, the world and the devil assail him. By the flesh is meant the old evil nature inherited from Adam and existing in the regenerate man alongside of the new nature implanted by grace. By the world is meant the world as alienated from God, especially the unbelieving people in the world. By the devil is meant the spirit of evil who seduced Eve and who seeks to beguile us from the simplicity which is in Christ (2 Cor. 11:3). Against these foes constant vigilance is essential because of the sudden unexpected, subtle and powerful nature of many of their assaults and temptations. Hence Christ's admonition is "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation: for the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. 26:41). The lack of watchfulness and a complacent unconcern or self-sufficiency have brought about the ruin of many a Christian.

Courage. The Christian needs courage. His life involves a continuous struggle against difficulties and a continuous and strenuous warfare against the powers of evil. He cannot preserve what has become his in Christ, unless he is ready to defend it at all hazards against all assailants. Without courage he will surrender or flee when he ought to stand his ground. He must have the courage to do right in the face of the strongest opposition, to bear ridicule and persecution, to face danger, and even to endure a martyr's death in Christ's cause. Many a Christian has had to seal his faith with his blood. He must quit himself like a man and be strong (1 Cor. 16:13), be steadfast and unmovable (1 Cor. 15:58), in nothing terrified by his adversaries (Phil. 1:28), and obey God rather than men (Acts 4:19; 5:29). The Christian knows that he had better lose all else, even life itself, than lose Christ.

Temperance. The Christian needs temperance. Moderation in all things is enjoined by the apostle. The lack of moderation leads directly into sin. Virtues themselves become vices when carried to excess. Temperance, like wisdom and courage, held a high place as a virtue among the ancients. For the Christian it is an indispensable virtue, if he would maintain body and soul in the highest state of efficiency for God's service. That which, if indulged in with moderation, may be a benefit to body or soul will harm them, if carried to excess. That which is not a sin in itself will become a sin, if the bounds of moderation are not observed. Both Paul and Peter include temperance in the list of Christian virtues which they enumerate (Gal. 5:23; 2 Pet. 1:5-7). It is an essential virtue in those who would obtain an incorruptible crown (1 Cor. 9:25).

CHAPTER XI

LOVE TO OUR FELLOW MEN

THE Christian's love for his fellow men flows from and is a corollary of his love for God. It is included as an integral part of the great double commandment of love. It underlies the commandments of the second table of the law. Its absence is a proof of the absence of love to God (1 John 4:20).

Love recognizes that our fellow men are the same kind of beings as ourselves, members of the same great human family, and entitled to the same rights and privileges; that they are ends in themselves, as we are; and that they are not to be used as means for our selfish purposes. Hence, Christ's Golden Rule is, "As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." God has the same love for others as for us, and desires their salvation as well as ours; Christ has suffered and died for them as well as for us; and the gracious invitation of the Gospel is addressed to them as well as to us. Since our attitude toward ourselves and others is to be modeled after God's, it follows that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves. And as God in his love for men seeks their genuine welfare, so we in our love for our fellow men should have a real desire for their temporal and eternal good.

True love for their fellow men will be found only in those persons who have first been brought to love God; it is the outgrowth of love to God. There are, indeed, an altruism and a philanthropy which are very admirable from the human standpoint, but which do not have their root and source in love to God. We are far from denying to such persons the credit which belongs to them. But altruism and philanthropy which do not flow from love to God lack the divine element of solicitude for the genuine and *eternal* welfare of men.

Its Scope. The Christian's love for his fellows is universal. It is wide as the race, and includes within its compass all the nations of the earth. To Christian love distinctions of race, color, language and the like do not exist. It includes all men everywhere, just as God's love does. This universality of love is a distinctive characteristic of Christianity. The Greeks recognized no obligation to men beyond their Hellenic race; all others were despised as barbarians. Their conception of their duty to their fellow countrymen was comprehended in the virtue of justice. If they practiced beneficence, it was regarded as an act of justice, and not of love. The Stoics introduced a certain degree of cosmopolitanism into the thinking of their day, but it took no practical shape, and remained only a theory. In practice they limited their actions to those which could be performed without seriously discommoding themselves. Injuries were not forgiven, but treated with contempt.

The Jews felt bound to their fellow Jews, but looked on the Gentiles with disdain, and carefully avoided contaminating contact with them. Their law enjoined upon them to love their neighbor; but they interpreted this to mean their Jewish neighbor. And while their law laid upon them certain obligations with regard to the strangers among them, this obligation, as they regarded it, was not at all identical with love in the Christian sense.

Christianity has broken down all walls, and includes all men everywhere among those who are to be loved. Men's goodness or badness, their claims or lack of claims upon our favor, their friendship or their enmity do not in any way alter the fundamental obligation. The publicans and sinners, says Christ, love those who love them: but it is the distinctive mark of the Christian that he loves those who do not love him.

Its Nature. Christian love to all men is not to be confounded with the love of friendship. Friendship implies some degree of intimacy, and is based on a certain harmony of mind and purpose; it cannot exist without mutual understanding and sympathy. Evidently the obligation to love all men cannot be an obligation to live on intimate terms of friendship with all. The great number of persons to be loved would in itself make this impossible. Again, our enemies would not consent to live on terms of friendship with us; and if Christian love meant friendship, we could not love them. It is not desirable to live on terms of friendship with all. Our friends should be carefully chosen, and there are many persons whom we as Christians love, but whom we could not admit into our homes. Scripture warns us that evil communications corrupt good morals; and its command to love all men certainly does not mean that we are to associate on terms of intimacy with the wicked (Ps. 1).

Christian love is love in the sense of good will and benevolence. It is desiring and seeking for others as for ourselves everything that is good and nothing that is bad. This love prompts us to pray for our enemies, to return good for evil and kindness for hatred (Matt. 5:39, 44; Rom. 12; 21), and to forgive those who injure or offend us (Matt. 18:21; 22; Luke 17:4). Unless we possess this forgiving love we shall lose our own forgiveness (Matt. 18:35). We are taught to pray that God would forgive us as we forgive those who offend us (Matt. 6:12). Christian love means the elimination of hatred, malice, envy and similar feelings, and the presence of a reconciling and forgiving spirit.

Brotherly Love. The love of our fellow men takes the special form of brotherly love in the case of our fellow Christians. It is a love modeled after God's love; and God loves the Christians in a special way. He loves all men with the love of compassion; but He loves the Christians with the love of complacency. He is united with them in a fellowship of mutual love. Christians, being united together in God, are united with one another. There is a fellowship of believers, and this fellowship is marked by brotherly love. It is love based on the possession of a common God and Savior, a common faith and a common hope. This brotherly love is enjoined by Christ (John 15:12). It is to be unfeigned (1 Pet. 1:22), and its highest manifestation is found in the sacrifice of our life for the brethren (John 15:13). It is the distinctive characteristic of the new covenant (John 13:34). In the early days of the Church the love of Christians for one another made a profound impression upon the heathen round about them. This brotherly love ought to be more evident than it often is in the relations of Christians to one another to-day.

Resultant Virtues. Love to our fellow men manifests itself under various forms in response to the demands made upon it. A long list of resultant virtues is traceable to love to our neighbor. Some of the forms which it takes are justice, kindness, long-suffering, humility, courtesy, unselfishness, chastity, honesty and truthfulness.

Justice, which was regarded by the ancients as one of the four primary virtues, is a Christian virtue of a high order, and in the Christian sense is a manifestation of love. The very first obligation of love to others is to grant them their just rights. It is idle to talk of showing kindness or mercy to any man so long as we have not first been willing even to be just to him. The Golden Rule given by Christ has in it a basic element of justice. Men will not be in a mood to accept benevolence so long as they have not been granted what they regard as their just rights.

Kindness manifests itself in a disposition of loving good will toward others. Love is kind (1 Cor. 13:4) in thought, word and deed. It goes out in mercy toward the wretched, in pity toward the suffering, in forgiveness toward those who have injured or offended us, and in helpfulness toward those who are in any need. True kindness will hurt in order to heal, but will not inflict unnecessary suffering. Brutal frankness is no virtue. Kindness is first of all in the mind. If we think and judge kindly of others, we will also speak and act in kindness.

Long-suffering is the disposition to be patient with the faults of others (1 Cor. 13:4) and not to be easily provoked (1 Cor. 13:5). It is love bearing with the faults of others and exercising patience under much provocation. It is often easier to see other people's faults than our own. But we have them, and that fact should help us to be patient with others and to give them time to overcome their faults. The true Christian will be more concerned about the beam in his own eye than about the mote in his brother's eye (Matt. 7:3).

Humility excludes boastfulness or vainglory, and forbids the assumption of an air of superiority on account of the possession, real or supposed, of social, intellectual or financial advantages. It excludes harsh judgment of others and a "holier than thou" attitude. It remembers that God's grace and not our own strength have kept us from falling into sins into which others have fallen (2 Cor. 3:5; 1 Cor. 15:10), and that we ourselves still have many faults which call for forgiveness on the part of God and man. Humility inclines the Christian to serve others even in the lowliest capacities (John 13:12-17). It constitutes true greatness (Matt. 18:4), and was a conspicuous virtue in such men as Moses, David, Paul and Luther.

Courtesy or seemliness is love observing the proprieties and giving proper consideration to the feelings of others. Love doth not behave itself unseemly (1 Cor. 13:5). Courtesy involves many questions of tact, politeness, amiability, reasonableness, helpfulness, etc., which are not directly enumerated in the commandments, but which are nevertheless included in the law of love. Rudeness, crudeness, harshness, lack of consideration for other people's feelings and the like do not accord with Christian love.

Unselfishness is the very essence of Christian love. Love seeketh not her own (1 Cor. 13:5), but seeks the things of others, not in the sense of seeking to get them away from others, but in the sense of seeking the gain and happiness of others. If men were thoroughly unselfish, the difficulties in the family and in the social and industrial life would speedily be adjusted, and the causes of friction be removed.

Chastity is love guarding the purity of others as well as our own. It is specially enjoined in the commandment not to commit adultery, and is fundamentally a state of the heart, to which words and acts simply give outward expression. The pure in heart shall see God (Matt. 5:8). The

Holy Spirit cannot dwell in a heart given over to lascivious imaginations.

Truthfulness is love guarding the good name of others against defamation, and their mind against error and falsehood. It is especially enjoined in the commandment not to bear false witness. While apparently a matter of word and speech, it is first of all a matter of mind and heart. It is genuineness and sincerity, the absence of pretense and hypocrisy. Just in the measure in which men believe us to be sincere and genuine, do they have real confidence in us.

CHAPTER XII

LOVE TO THE WORLD IN GENERAL

A Right Attitude Necessary. The fact that the regenerate man lives in the world makes it necessary for him to have a right attitude or disposition toward it. That attitude is determined by the attitude which God takes toward it. So far as the world is restored through grace, God loves it with the love of complacency. So far as it is still living in ignorance of Him, He loves it with the love of compassion. So far as the world has a future which is comprehended in His plan of grace, God loves it with a seeking and saving love. In all three respects the attitude of the Christian toward the world should be the same as God's.

The Natural Not in Itself Sinful. The Christian should not, like the extreme Pietist, the theocratic idealist and the ascetic, ignore the world or regard the natural as in itself sinful. Nor should he, with the pantheist, regard his right relation to the world as in itself constituting his right relation to God. For the relation to God and to the world are separate and distinct relations, and the latter is to be determined by the former.

The world in itself is not sinful. As a creature of God it is good. It is sinful only in so far as it has become alienated from God. What is good in the world is to be received and employed for the purposes for which God intended it. The Christian is not meant to lead a barren and joyless existence. The world and the things in the world may be enjoyed by him so long as there is no sinful use of them. He is to use this world and not abuse it. He is perfectly at liberty to enjoy himself in innocent ways. He must avoid the extremes of a despising of the world on the one hand, and of worldliness on the other. What is innocent in itself may cease to be so under certain circumstances or if indulged in to excess.

The Christian in the World. The Old Testament saints, especially in the Psalms, voice their joy over the good gifts of God in this world; but at the same time they call attention to the transitory character of all earthly things (Ps. 90; Job; Eccl.). In the New Testament we find Christ taking part in the innocent festivities of the wedding at Cana (John 2), and refraining from the ascetic life of John the Baptist (Matt. 11:18, 19). Paul says that Christians should receive earthly blessings with thanksgiving (1 Tim. 4:4; 1 Cor. 10:30), be faithful in their earthly calling (Rom. 12:7), recognize the State as a beneficent institution of God (Rom. 13:1), and render to all their dues (Rom. 13:7).

But Not of It. Christianity does not take us out of our earthly environment, but gives us a new relation to it. The Christian is in the world, but not of it (John 17:14, 15). He is not meant to lead a life of physical separation from the world like the monk or the hermit; nor is he to find the essence of morality in frowning upon earthly joy and happiness. He has his place and work in the world, and the good things of the world are for his use. But he is to be animated by a different spirit from that which animates the "world." The things of this world must always be kept subordinate to God and the things of God.

A Free Man in Christ. The regenerate man starts out upon his Christian life, not with a host of limitations and regulations, but with the freedom of the child of God. The

Christian is a free man in Christ. Having been transformed inwardly by the grace of God, he is to be guided in his conduct, not by rules and regulations from without, but by his enlightened conscience. He will refrain from many things simply out of consideration for his neighbor; but on the other hand he will not permit his Christian liberty to be taken away from him. He will avoid the extreme of ascetism on the one hand and of laxness and undue latitude on the other. It will be difficult for him to escape criticism. The Jews said of John, who came neither eating nor drinking, that he had a devil. They said of Christ, who came eating and drinking, that He was a gluttonous man and a winebibber (Matt. 11:18, 19).

Christianity Not a Religion of Gloom. It is important not to impress outsiders with the view that Christianity is a religion of gloom; and equally important not to impress them with the idea that there is not much difference between a believer and an unbeliever. Luther's attitude was very sane on this point. He enjoyed the good things of life, and found much joy in music, flowers and birds; but at the same time that he rejoiced in the world in God, he condemned rejoicing in the world apart from God. The important thing is, that the love of God be kept supreme in the heart, and that all earthly enjoyments and employments be kept subordinate to that love.

The Christian does not love the world (1 John 2:15), but seeks to escape the corruption that is in it through lust (2 Pet. 1:4). He has no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but reproves them (Eph. 5:11). He separates himself even from the natural when it becomes an instrument of sin (Matt. 5:29, 30). While this separation involves pain, it is not an arbitrarily inflicted pain like that of the flagellants, but an inward pain which is a necessary concomitant of discipleship—a bearing of Christ's cross and a being crucified to the world (Matt. 10:38; Gal. 2:20; 5:24). Since the world hates those who will not join in its sinful ways, even as it hated Christ (John 15:18, 19; John 17:14), the Christian must suffer patiently after the example of Christ (1 Pet. 2:21-23). This suffering gives to the Christian's life a tinge of sorrow (2 Cor. 1:5; 1 Pet. 1:6), which, however, is more than counterbalanced by the joy which is his in Christ.

In so far as the world is in antagonism to God, the Christian opposes it, even when he can do so only at the cost of suffering. He must be ready to endure even martyrdom in his defense of truth and right. In so far as the world is estranged from God and lost in sin, the Christian seeks its salvation, and gladly assists according to his ability and opportunity in the propagation of the Gospel. He labors personally for the salvation of individuals, the uplift of society and the Christianization of the spirit and life of the world, and supports the efforts of the churchly agencies of Home, Inner and Foreign Missions. In so far as the world is one in which God has definite plans to accomplish, the Christian's attitude is one of zeal and hopefulness. The kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ (Rev. 11:15).

Optimism and Pessimism. The naturalistic view of the world inclines either toward optimism or pessimism. Optimism regards the world as the best possible world, and as affording the best possible conditions for the self-development of humanity. It ignores the fact that the world is in an abnormal state on account of sin, and closes its eyes to the moral disorder that is in the world. It regards evil as a necessary condition of progress, and as only a defect or limitation which is due to ignorance and which will be removed by advancing culture.

Pessimism assumes that the world is essentially evil; that even if it once was better, it is now hopelessly bad; that man was created for sorrow and suffering; that evil is ever on the increase; and that life holds out no prospects for the realization of the highest ideal.

The Christian is neither an optimist nor a pessimist. He looks neither at the good nor at the evil exclusively, but views the world as embraced in the sovereignty of God and as being guided and directed to the end which God purposes. He rejects the errors found in optimism and in pessimism, and combines in himself the elements of truth found in them. He realizes that the world has become estranged from God, and that consequently it is full of evil and suffering. But he believes in the ultimate triumph of good over evil and in the realization of the kingdom of God. That which enables him to view the world with hopefulness is the redemption in Christ by which God has prepared for the world a way of deliverance from sin and from the evils which have followed in its train. Viewed as it is in itself, the world would drive us to pessimism; but viewed as a world that is salvable and as one which God is seeking to save by His grace, we are led to what might perhaps be called a Christian optimism or meliorism. God doeth all things well; and in due time we shall see that this is so.

PART III

CHRISTIAN CONDUCT

CHAPTER XIII

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF CONDUCT

The Norm of Christian Conduct is the will of God as revealed in His law. To this norm the Christian seeks to conform his every word and act. To do this he is concerned not only to obey the outward letter of the law, but to obey its spirit. The commandment not to kill is not properly obeyed by a mere refraining from murder, but by refraining from every act which would bring injury to another, and by performing every act by which it lies in our power to help our neighbor in time of danger and want. The commandment not to steal is not fulfilled by mere abstinence from theft or robbery, but by refraining from every act which would be a financial injury to our neighbor, and by performing those acts which will assist him in protecting what is rightfully his own. There is much conduct which passes the muster of legal requirements, but which is not entitled to be called ethical or Christian.

The law of God as the revelation of His will is perfect. No ethical demands of any kind can be made upon man over and above the requirements of the divine law, when that law is interpreted according to its spirit and not simply according to the letter. The law of God therefore is the *sole* norm of Christian conduct, and only those acts which are commanded in God's law are entitled to be called good works. The Roman Catholic doctrine, that obedience to the "evangelical counsels" of poverty, celibacy and implicit obedience to ecclesiastical superiors constitutes a higher order of morality, is a delusion. No special holiness is acquired by obedience to ecclesiastical injunctions which are not demanded by the divine law.

Conduct, in order to be Christian, must conform to God's law not only in its actions, but in the motive by which the actions are prompted. It is a doing of the divine will out of love. Since this love is the result of the Christian's faith, ethical conduct is the fruit of faith working by love. The more faith as the appreciation of God's love grows, the more love grows and the more conduct conforms to the fundamental requirement of love contained in the law.

Duty and the Law. While the will of God is the norm of conduct, the special form in which that will makes its demand upon the human will is that of duty. Hence the ethical character of conduct is found in its correspondence with duty. As has been described in the chapter on conscience, the law lays down the general principles or rules of conduct, while duty expresses the particular form which our action must take in order to conform to the requirement of the law. Duty and law are therefore not identical. My duty is determined by the application of the law to the circumstances in my individual case. The law is fixed, but the particular duty which must be done in order to meet its demand must be determined by the conscience of the individual. The law always remains the same, but the duty imposed upon us by the law varies with the circumstances and the individual. The law says, "Love thy neighbor as thyself"; duty says, "In view of the law, the circumstances and your qualifications, you should do so and so."

Since duty is the expression of the particular action required of us under the circumstances by the divine law, it is an obligation which we owe to God. It is the demand of the divine will upon ours. It is enforced by divine authority, and is accompanied by a threat of divine retribution for failure to obey. But at the same time duty is also enforced by our own conscience, and is an obligation which we owe to ourselves as moral beings. The penalty for the non-performance of duty takes primarily the form of an accusation and condemnation by our own conscience; but this self-judgment is accompanied and enforced by the consciousness of the judgment and condemnation of God in whose image we as moral beings have been fashioned.

Classification of Duties. Since all duties are the obligation which the one will of God imposes upon us, they constitute a unit. Obedience to God's will involves the performance of every duty, and hence the shaping of life as an ethical whole. But if we regard the duties concretely, they may be distinguished and classified. Thus since all the commandments of God have a positive and a negative side, both enjoining and prohibiting something, it is possible to classify duties as positive and negative; namely, what we ought to do, and what we ought not to do. A more satisfactory classification, however, is possible. Since some of the commandments directly concern our relation to God, while others indirectly concern our relation to Him and directly concern our relation to our fellow men, and the second table of the law implies that we have a duty to ourselves, we obtain the following three classes of duties; namely, to God, to Ourselves and to Our Fellow Men. The last class falls naturally into four subdivisions corresponding to the social relations in which the Christian finds himself in the world; namely, the Family, the Church, the State, and Society in General.

While in an inaccurate sense men sometimes speak of duties to impersonal beings and even to inanimate creation, there are no such duties in the strict sense of the term, because these objects are not ethical beings. So-called duties toward impersonal nature are really duties toward ourselves, toward other men, or toward God, who has placed these earthly objects around us as means to ethical ends. It is our duty to use the creature in accordance with God's purposes, and not to abuse it.

Conflict of Duties. The question of a conflict of duties is an old one, and is found in the dramas of the Greeks and the ethics of Cicero. By a conflict of duties we mean the occurrence of a situation in which two or more duties demand fulfillment at the same time, while only one can be attended to, and the others must be neglected. Theoretically a conflict of duties is impossible, because the will of God is a unit, and there can be only one duty which He requires of us at one time. The will of God applied to any situation cannot mean that two or more conflicting actions shall be performed by us simultaneously. Only one thing at a time can be our actual duty. The difficulty lies in the fact that we are not able to determine what the one thing is. The problem is complicated by the fact that it can never be our duty to neglect a duty. Hence what are called conflicts of duty do occur. These are due in part to man's inability to determine which of several claims upon him represents his real duty; and in part to the abnormality existing in the social relations on account of sin, or to the moral confusion and contradiction in which the individual's previous conduct has involved him. The conflict may therefore be apparent only, as a result of the inability of the person to discern his duty. On the other hand it may be real, because a previously neglected duty stands in the way of the performance of a present duty. And furthermore, while theoretically duties to the Church, the State, self and our fellow men may readily be harmonized with one another, in practice that harmonizing often presents great difficulties.

In those cases in which a man has so involved himself by previous unethical conduct that he finds himself in a predicament from which he cannot extricate himself except by telling a lie or committing some other wrong, the difficulty is to be solved by going back to the original error or wrong, and acknowledging and correcting that. In other cases, in which the individual is confronted by conflicting obligations, his duty is so dependent upon the particular nature of the situation, that no general rule for the solution of such problems can be laid down. Indeed, there are numerous instances in which no certain solution is possible, and the actual duty remains in doubt. In such cases it may be wise to seek advice from others who can view the matter in an objective and impersonal way. Even then the Christian may still be in doubt as to the course which duty indicates. In that case he will have to decide the matter by doing, as best he can, what is right under the circumstances. Any attempt to lay down rules for individual cases of conscience would lead to casuistry.

The Doctrine of Probabilism advocated by Jesuit moralists teaches that a person's choice of conduct may be decided on the basis of the opinion of authoritative ecclesiastical writers who deal with the conduct in question. It is mainly concerned with two problems: First, what percentage of such authorities is needed to give assurance that a certain action is right? And secondly, what minimum percentage of such authorities is needed to enable one to perform a certain action with a good conscience, even though the majority of the writers condemn the action as wrong? It will be seen that probabilism lays emphasis on what *may* be done, instead of on what *ought* to be done; on what is morally possible, instead of on what is morally right and necessary. The determination of Christian duty must not be based on the number of authorities that can be cited, but on the individual's personal conviction of the right. Other men's consciences cannot be substituted for our own.

CHAPTER XIV

THE NATURE OF CHRISTIAN CONDUCT

Two Kinds of Actions. The conduct of the Christian includes two kinds of actions: those which are done in fulfillment of a definite divine law; and those which, though not commanded in the law, are not in conflict with it, and hence are permissible. The former are what are called in theology "good works"; the latter are called "adiaphora."

Good Works. The fulfillment of duty, that is, the doing of what the divine law under the particular circumstances enjoins upon the individual person, results in ethical conduct or good works. The deeds which the Christian thus performs are called good works, not because they are good in the sense of perfect or because they meet the demands of the law completely, but because they are done by a person who stands in the right relation with God and acts from love to Him. As previously pointed out, they are the good fruits of the tree which has been made good by divine grace. Ethical conduct is conditioned on the right relation to God in Christ. "Good works do not make a good man; but a good man does good works." Disciples are the salt of the earth and the light of the world, because they are Christ's disciples. They are not His disciples because they are the salt of the earth and the light of the world (Matt. 5:13-16). Discipleship is the cause; the salt and the light are the result.

The ethical value of the works does not lie in the outward actions themselves, but in the new Christian disposition from which they spring. They are good works because they are done from that motive of love to God which is the fundamental requirement of the law. It is an error to suppose that their ethical value is increased, the more the doing of them conflicts with the inclinations. On the contrary, the more the inclination to evil has been overcome in the Christian and the less opposition of the old nature there is in him, the more progress has been made in sanctification, and the more perfect the good work is as a willing fulfillment of God's commands.

The Evangelical Counsels. Since the ethical conduct of the Christian is a unit, governed by the one principle of love, and comprising obedience to God's will as the sole norm, the Roman Catholic distinction between two orders of morality, the lower one consisting of obedience to the commandments of God and of the Church and the higher one consisting of obedience to the evangelical counsels of perfection, is unsound. Equally unsound are the assumptions that all good works are meritorious, and that obedience to the evangelical counsels as optional requirements results in supererogatory works. The so-called evangelical counsels are not optional courses of conduct, but contain a principle binding upon all, though the manner in which the principle is to be applied depends on the circumstances of the case (Matt. 19:12:21; Mark 10:21; 1 Cor. 7:7 seq.). Supererogatory works are impossible, because no man can meet all the demands of the divine law, and still less can he exceed them. In ascribing to good works a meritorious character and coördinating them with faith as the instrumental cause of salvation, the Roman Catholic Church sets the merits of Christ in the background. In opposition to this it must be maintained that good works have nothing to do with the obtaining of salvation, but that they are done and can be done only by one who is already saved by grace alone through faith.

Good Works the Fruit of Faith. Good works as the fruit of faith are distinguished from the works of the law. The latter have the outward form of obedience to the divine law, but they do not have behind them a Christian personality and the proper motive of love. Hence the works of the law are vain (Rom. 3:20, 27; 4:6; 9:32), while good works are commanded and are well-pleasing to God. There is a reward for the latter according to God's promise, but it is a reward of grace and not of merit. Though they are not to be done for the sake of a reward, but solely out of love and gratitude to God; yet, because they are performed by those who love him, they are, in spite of their imperfection, pleasing to God and will be rewarded. The believers shall be rewarded for enduring persecution for righteousness' sake (Matt. 5:11, 12), for loving their enemies (Luke 6:35), and for kindness to Christ's disciples even though it consists of the giving of a cup of cold water only (Matt. 10:41, 42). The final judgment will be according to men's works (Matt. 25:34-46), because the works are an evidence and proof of the existence of a right or wrong relation to Christ. He will penetrate beyond the outward works to the motive from which they have sprung.

Adiaphora. The ethical activity of the regenerate man embraces his whole life. Everything that he does is to be regulated by duty, and no action is morally indifferent when regarded from the subjective side. Everything that he does is either a right or a wrong thing for him to do; it is either in harmony with the inner principle of love or is opposed to it. There is, therefore, nothing in the Christian's conduct which may subjectively be characterized as indifferent.

But there is objectively a realm of the morally indifferent; that is, there are things which the Christian is not commanded to do nor forbidden to do. Thus the moral is not a matter of eating and drinking (Matt. 15:11; Mk. 7:15; Rom. 14:1-3, 17; 1 Cor. 8:8), nor of eating with unwashed hands Matt. 15:20), nor of the observance of days (Rom. 14:5, 6; Col. 2:16). These things belong to the sphere of personal freedom, where the law does not prescribe man's every action, but where he is left free to choose as he will.

But these things, which objectively considered are indifferent, acquire a moral significance when considered in relation to those things which are prescribed as duty. They must not be chosen if they conflict with duty in any way. Not everything which belongs to the category of the allowed or permitted is expedient for the Christian, either with respect to himself (1 Cor. 6:12) or with respect to his fellow men (Rom. 14:15; 1 Cor. 8:9). Hence, in the exercise of his liberty in matters that are permitted, the Christian is under the obligation of Christian forbearance. The exercise of his liberty must be regulated and determined by Christian love. He must, therefore, in view of possible moral peril to himself or of giving offense to weak brethren, refrain from doing some things which, in themselves considered, he has a perfect right to do; and on the other hand, he must do some things which in themselves considered he has a perfect right to refrain from doing.

Christian Freedom and Christian Expediency. While the Christian is to have a proper regard for the weak brethren, he should not permit them to exercise a tyranny over him, but should maintain his right of Christian liberty. He is not under obligation to allow other persons to impose the decisions of their consciences upon him, but should reserve to himself the decision as to what is right or not right for him to do. Each must obey his own conscience. And thus it may sometimes happen that what is quite permissible for one man, may not be permissible for another, because the latter believes it to be wrong. The man who ate of meat sacrificed to idols, knowing that an idol is nothing in the world and that there is only the one true God, could eat with a good conscience and did no wrong; while the other man who believed that the meat by its being sacrificed to idols had become spiritually contaminated, and that to eat of it would mean participation in idolatry, could not eat of it without sin, because his conscience forbade it (1 Cor. 8; Rom. 14:14).

Pietism and Puritanism. Pietism as represented by Spener and his successors practically prohibited all pleasure and relaxation as sinful, and regarded all earthly amusements, such as dancing, games, wedding festivities, secular music, the stage, etc., as inconsistent with true Christianity. It assumed that all the Christian's actions proceed directly out of his fellowship with God, and ignored the fact that there is a large area of the permissible in which the Christian is free to shape his conduct as he will, so long as what he does is not in conflict with true love to God. Puritanism held a somewhat similar view.

The adiaphora belong to the sphere of the individual Christian moral judgment. They involve questions of conduct which every Christian must seek to answer for himself on the basis of an enlightened conscience. It has been said that those who are strictest in such matters as amusements and the like are not always the best Christians. To this it may be added, however, that those who are laxest in such matters are not necessarily the best Christians either. "*In mediis tutissimus ibis.*"

The Vocation. The conduct of the Christian will largely be shaped by his vocation in life and the duties which his position in the world lays upon him. Every honest calling has a dignity of its own, and is a fit sphere in which to serve God. The Roman Church of the Middle Ages had practically taught that it was impossible to serve God acceptably in an earthly calling; but the Reformation restored the vocation to its proper place and dignity.

When Christ speaks of the separation of the believers from the world, He means separation in mind and heart. Though they are in the world, they are not of it. But the early Church misunderstood Him to mean outward bodily separation from society, and soon ran into monasticism. The Church of the Middle Ages so emphasized the clerical and monastic life, that the common life and the ordinary vocations of men fell into religious discredit. But Luther maintained that the Christian is to carry out God's will in his calling, and thus enabled men once more to follow their earthly vocations with a good conscience and with the assurance that they could be good Christians in them. He showed that true holiness consists in believing in Christ and faithfully attending to the duties of one's station in life, and not in external separation from other men nor in humanly devised works of asceticism and monasticism. Good works, Luther taught, are those which are called for by a man's vocation and station. The earthly calling is to be sanctified by faith, and all things are to be done as unto the Lord. "If a maidservant sweeps the house and does it in faith in Christ, she does a better work and renders a greater service to God than St. Anthony in the desert."

The True Ideal of Christian Conduct is the cheerful and faithful performance of the duties which devolve upon us in our particular position in life. This will very frequently involve not only the doing of many things that we do not like to do, but often a routine that is monotonous and a drudgery that is irksome. The doing of these things, however, is not only essential to success in any calling, but a vital element in the performance of Christian duty. To serve God does not mean to look around for something special to do in order to please God, but faithfully to do day by day the duties which belong to our station. This does not mean that there are no special religious activities in which the Christian may and should engage; but it does imply that his fundamental duty is to fulfill the obligations which rest upon him in the daily round of his earthly activities. Pietism with its emphasis upon specifically religious activity deserves the credit of having aroused the Church's interest in Christian missions. But it erred in overemphasizing the direct religious activity and undervaluing the importance of faithfulness in the daily routine of life.

Paul declares that conversion to Christianity is not to be followed by a wholesale giving up of earthly vocations (1 Cor. 7:20), but by the service of God in the sphere in which men find themselves. John the Baptist did not command those who repented to forsake their callings, but to show proper ethical deportment in them (Luke 3:12-14). The Epistles contain numerous exhortations to Christians to fulfill the duties of the station in which they find themselves, as husbands, wives, parents, children, citizens, masters, servants and the like (Eph. 5:22, 25; 6:1; Col. 3:18, 19; Rom. 13:1-5; 1 Pet. 2:13; 3:1). Luther selected a number of these exhortations and added them to his Catechism as a Table of Duties.

CHAPTER XV

DUTIES TO GOD

Since the good which exists in the mind in the form of virtue finds expression through the acts of the will in the performance of duty, there is a close relation between virtue and duty. It would lead to much useless repetition, therefore, to consider under the aspect of duty what we have already considered under that of virtue. In treating of our duties to God we shall, accordingly, confine ourselves to the subjects of Prayer, the Oath and the Vow.

Prayer. Prayer is the active communion or conversation of the believing heart with God. Its necessity for the spiritual life is fundamental. There can be no Christian life without it. It is an unceasing activity of the Christian, sometimes conscious, sometimes unconscious, like the breathing of the body. The Lord commands His disciples to pray always (Luke 21:36:18:1); and the apostle gives the same exhortation (Eph. 6:18). This does not mean continuous articulate prayer, but a constant prayerful attitude of the heart. The soul should always be attuned to prayer, even though mind and body be temporarily engrossed in some earthly occupation. The avenues of communication with God should be kept constantly open. It should always be possible for the Christian to engage in a conscious prayer, however brief; and no activity which would be inconsistent with such a prayer should ever be engaged in by him. The relation of mutual love between the Christian and God renders constant communion with God inevitable. The Christian is constantly turning to God, his dearest Friend, in gratitude for benefits received and in petitions for forgiveness, wisdom, guidance, protection and strength. A spirit of prayer underlies all his activities.

Its Nature. Prayer is not a means of making our thoughts and wants known to God; for He knows them without our prayer. It is rather the glad expression of the belief that He does know all our soul, and of our willingness that He should know it. It is the opening up of our whole heart to God that He may enter with all His fullness of blessings. It is the pouring out of our soul to our best Friend, and it draws us into closer bonds of sympathy with Him. It is an act of worship—an acknowledgment that God is our Lord and our heavenly Father. It is an act of thankfulness, prompted by the consciousness of His love and mercy. It is an act of confession, prompted by the sense of our sinfulness. It is an act of petition, prompted by our need of forgiveness and of many other blessings. It is an act of intercession, prompted by our love for our fellow men and a concern for their bodily and spiritual welfare.

The Essential Factor in prayer is the inner communion of the heart with God. Where this exists, there will, of course, also be outward engagement in public prayer in church and at other times and places, and also in private and family devotions. The Christian will have stated times of prayer. As regards the emphasis laid upon the outward forms of prayer, much will depend upon the individual. One insists on elaborate ritual and ceremony, and another does not. One requires many stated times of prayer, while another finds his chief delight in quiet internal communion with God.

The religious life of all nations and tribes has expressed itself in prayer; usually also in sacrifice. Sacrifice was always accompanied by prayer; but prayer often occurred alone. Among the Greeks public and private acts were accompanied by prayer; but it was more an external ceremony than an inner communion such as we understand real prayer to be. Frequent repetition of the same prayer was supposed to make it efficacious. With the decay of the belief in the gods there came a decay of worship, and prayer often degenerated into superstition and magic.

Prayer in the Old Testament was the expression of faith in Jehovah as the God of Salvation. The relation of the believers to God was conceived of as that of servants, and not, as in the New Testament, that of friends (John 15:15). The Psalms are a treasury of prayers, and exhibit the spirit of the Old Testament stage of revelation.

Not a Meritorious Act. With the Pharisees prayer degenerated into an *opus operatum.* The purpose of prayer no longer was real communion with God, but careful observance of set times and forms of prayer. They made a show of their prayers, made broad their phylacteries and used vain repetitions (Matt. 6:5-7; 23:5). The content of the prayer, the posture to be assumed, and similar externalities were all carefully prescribed. Praying was regarded as a meritorious act. Its effectiveness was supposed to be proportioned to its length and to the number of repetitions.

The Church of the Middle Ages, followed by the Roman Catholic Church, viewed prayer not so much as communion with God but as a meritorious act, along with fasting and almsgiving. The mystics regarded prayer as a means of absorption in God. The Reformation gave to prayer its true place as communion with God by restoring the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

There is often an observance of the forms of prayer while there is no real prayer or communion of the heart with God (Matt. 15:8; Isa. 28:13). In the matter of prayer, as in every other duty, everything hinges on the question whether our relation to God is what it ought to be. The lack of true prayerfulness is due to the lack of real and genuine fellowship with God. And the remedy must be found in the removal of the impenitence, unbelief and worldliness which stand in the way.

Some Practical Aspects. As regards certain practical aspects of prayer, the following observations may be made. Prayer may be offered in our own words or in those of another; the essential thing is that the prayer be the genuine utterance of the heart. The Church's books for public service and many manuals for private devotions contain prayers which may be used with profit. The posture should ordinarily be one which indicates a reverent and humble spirit; but the essential thing is that there be reverence and humility in the heart. The Church from the early days sanctioned standing during public prayer on Sunday, because Sunday is a day of rejoicing over the resurrection of Christ. Kneeling was recommended on fast days and days of humiliation.

The nature of true prayer is seen in Christ. His life was one of constant and perfect communion with His heavenly Father. The references to His praying are frequent (Mk. 1:35; Luke 5:16; 6:12; John 11:41, 42; Matt. 11:25; John 17:1-26; Matt. 26:36-39; Luke 23:34; Matt. 27:46; Luke 23:46). He never prayed for forgiveness, because He had no sin.

An example of a true prayer is given us by Christ in the Lord's Prayer. It is given as a model, not so much of form as of content. It expresses what all His disciples under all circumstances should pray for. It shows the spirit of child-like confidence in which we should approach God: points out that the things of God—the hallowing of His name, the coming of His kingdom, and the doing of His will—should be our foremost concern in praying; and that upon these petitions there fitly follow petitions for the supply of our own bodily and spiritual wants (Matt. 6:9-13). The Christian appropriately adds the Lord's prayer to his own, as a summary of all the things for which he should pray.

Prayer has the promise of an answer from God. But to be heard, we must not ask amiss (Jas. 4:3). We must ask for things which God has promised to give in answer to prayer, and not for things arbitrarily and willfully chosen by ourselves. We must pray in Christ's name. This means not simply the adding of the phrase, "This we ask in Christ's name," but it means asking as those who believe and trust in Christ as Savior, as those who realize that they have no right to expect any good except for His sake, and as those who ask in His spirit, and are ready to say with Him, "Not my will but thine be done."

The Oath is related to prayer in that, like prayer, it is a calling upon God's name. In its essential nature it is a calling on God to bear witness to the truth of a statement or statements. Perjury is a mocking of the truth and of God, and is a great crime which subjects him who is guilty of it to the condemnation of God and to the punishment of the State. For the truly regenerate man the oath is superfluous, because he may be relied on to tell the truth without an oath. But from the standpoint of humanity in general the oath is a legal necessity for the eliciting of the truth from those persons who otherwise would not tell it.

The oath contains three elements: 1. An affirmation in God's name. 2. A calling on God as the highest witness of the truth. 3. A calling on God to punish, if the truth be not told. Whenever an oath is necessary it is to be made in God's name, but is never to be a false one (Lev. 19:12). It is permissible when legally demanded, as we see from the fact that Christ spoke under oath before the high priest (Matt. 26:63, 64). In the Old Testament God swears by Himself, because there is none higher (Gen. 22:16; Jer. 44:26; Ezek. 33:11; Ps. 89:3; 110:4). Christ warns against swearing by any other name than God's, and also against swearing needlessly (Matt. 5:33-36). Swearing by any other name than God's is a subterfuge, and is a futile attempt to escape responsibility. Christ's words have been misunderstood by some persons as forbidding all swearing. But what he really forbids is swearing in ordinary conversation. He does not forbid the legal oath. The oath was forbidden by the Waldensians, the Bohemian Brethren, and the Anabaptists, and is to-day regarded as sinful by the Quakers and the Mennonites.

Legal oaths are those of Witness, of Innocence, of Allegiance, of Office. The oath of witness demands that we shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The earthly administration of justice is impossible without the sanctity of the oath. In taking oaths, no mental reservations dare be made. Oaths taken under compulsion, if not involving the doing of what is wrong, are to be kept. Oaths taken to perform sinful deeds are not to be kept, and the wrong oath is to be repented of. Right oaths are those which are demanded by the love of God and our neighbor.

The Vow is a free and voluntary promise made to God. Vows may be divided into two classes: those which are simply the voluntary assumption of duty, and those by which the Christian binds himself to something which God has not commanded. To the former, which may be called vows in the wide sense, belong the baptismal vow, the marriage vow, and the vows of office (the ministry, the diaconate, etc.). To the latter belong vows which are made out of gratitude to guard against forgetting a benefit already received, or which have regard to a benefit hoped for; and also vows of abstinence made in order to guard against a particular temptation. No vows of the latter class are irrevocable; and they ought never to be made for life but only for a limited time, because circumstances may subsequently make the fulfillment of the vow wrong. Furthermore, such special vows must be carefully guarded against the notion that they are particularly pleasing to God, or that they are something done over and beyond our duty, thus constituting a merit. They do not make a man better than the man who does not vow. They are proper and permissible only in so far as they are helpful in disciplining the will and in enabling a man to conform more completely to the will of God. Like crutches, they are not a sign of strength, but of weakness. The Christian is more perfect if he has no need of special vows to help him to conform to God's will. They are not necessary, and do not constitute a merit.

The first and fundamental vow of the Christian is his baptismal vow, and none other is necessary, because in baptism the Christian once for all vows to give himself completely to God. Confirmation brings a repetition of the baptismal vow, but not a new vow. On the basis of the baptismal vow alone, and without any special vows, it is the duty of Christians to yield themselves to God (Rom. 6:13), to bring forth fruit to God (Rom. 7:4), and to present their bodies to Him as a living sacrifice (Rom. 12:1). The threefold monastic vow of celibacy, poverty and obedience has no merit, and does not lead to a higher state of holiness. Since all vows should be voluntary, free from all constraint, and well considered, monastic vows are not binding when he who has made them has come to better knowledge through the Holy Scriptures. Vows are unethical, if they contain the idea of bribing God to grant His blessing in a case in which it is believed that He would not otherwise grant it; or if they purpose to gain a benefit from God in return for some deed on man's part.

CHAPTER XVI

DUTIES TO OURSELVES

The duties which the Christian owes to himself may be subsumed under two heads; namely, Self-preservation and Self-development. Brought into fellowship with God by divine grace through Christ, his duty to himself is to remain in that fellowship, and to be increasingly confirmed in it; for that fellowship constitutes the highest good attainable by man. In the nature of the case these duties are bound up with his duties toward God and his fellow men, and cannot, except in a merely formal way, be considered separately. The Christian life is a unit: and living in fellowship with God implies an earnest effort to perform every duty.

Spiritual Self-preservation, which means perseverance in the faith and in fellowship with God, is an obligation laid upon the Christian by every consideration of his own temporal and eternal well-being. In that fellowship he possesses salvation and moral freedom. It is a fellowship which may be lost by careless living and the neglect of those things necessary for its maintenance. Hence the admonition of Paul is, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall" (1 Cor. 10:12). The Christian is to abide in Christ (John 15:4), to walk as Christ walked (1 John 2:6), to hold fast the truth (1 John 2:24), and to keep Christ's commandments (1 John 3:24). He is to continue in the faith grounded and settled (Col. 1:23), and to be faithful unto death (Rev. 2:10), that he may have confidence and not be ashamed before Christ at His coming (1 John 2:28). Since the old evil nature persists in the Christian alongside of the new nature implanted by grace, and he is constantly exposed to temptation from this evil nature as well as from the world and the devil; and since, moreover, he is not only subject to the sufferings and afflictions common to mankind but is exposed to hardships, sufferings and persecutions that are peculiar to the believer, the duty of self-preservation resolves itself into the fourfold duty of Care for Body and Soul, Denial of Self, Resistance to Temptation, and Bearing the Cross.

Care for the Body. The body is not the seat of moral evil as Plato and the ascetics imagined; and it is not to be neglected or maltreated, but cared for as an integral part of man. Without it he would be incomplete. The body is to be raised from the dead and glorified in order that man may be a complete and perfect man in the next world. The body has a dignity of its own. It is God's handiwork (Gen. 2:7); and in the case of the believers it is the temple of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. 6:19), and is to be presented to God as a living sacrifice. It is beautifully and wonderfully made, and exquisitely adapted to be the material organism through which the soul acts. Christ in becoming incarnate took on a human body as well as a human soul. The body, therefore, is not to be despised or abused, but to receive proper attention and care. It is not to be pampered; but its proper claims are to be regarded. It is to be made and kept a responsive instrument for the activity of the regenerate man.

It is therefore an ethical obligation to observe the laws of health, and proper hours of labor, rest and recreation; to avoid dissipation, to exercise temperance in eating and drinking, to wear proper clothing, to care for the sanitary condition of the home, the office and the factory, and in general to do those things which will promote the efficiency of the body as the organ of the regenerate soul. What a man is able to accomplish in any line of activity depends in large measure on the condition of his body. To take proper care of it is, therefore, a Christian duty. On the other hand, the body is not to be treated as if it were the chief part of man, or as if man consisted of a body only and no soul. Materialists deny the soul's existence; but many persons who disclaim theoretical materialism neglect the soul and live as practical materialists.

As the soul is the nobler part of man, its care is even more important than that of the body. This care is twofold: care for the soul on its mental side, and care for the soul on its spiritual side.

The Soul as Mind. The soul on its earthly side as mind is to be cultivated and raised to the highest point of efficiency. While the mind of man is supposed by some persons to be simply a higher development of the same kind of mind possessed by the brute, it differs from that of the brute not only in degree but in kind. It is capable of actual education; it has powers and capabilities which are totally foreign to the mind of the brute. And just as it is the Christian's duty to make his body the efficient organ of the soul, so it is his duty to educate and train his mind, that it may be an efficient instrument of the regenerate self for the appreciation and the doing of things which fall in the line of duty.

This education of the mind means not simply the storing of the mind with information, but the cultivation of its powers to keenness of discernment, accurate discrimination, ability to concentrate, perseverance and tenacity of purpose, assimilation and reproduction, and the like. This education will be limited by the capacity of the mind; but within this limitation there will always be a wide margin for development. Care should be exercised against a one-sided development of some powers to the total neglect of others. But this must not be misunderstood to mean that there is to be no special stress laid upon some particular line of education. The latter is necessary in view of the fact that every man has his particular place in the world and a particular work to do. His aim should be to develop his mind in such a way as to enable him to do his work with the greatest efficiency. But at the same time he should guard against a completely one-sided development which would atrophy certain faculties of the mind, and close up intellectual avenues which ought to be kept open.

The Soul as Spirit. The care of the soul on its spiritual side necessitates a constant attitude of opposition to the powers of evil, and a patient endurance of the hardships which divine providence ordains for us. It involves Self-denial, Resistance to Temptation, and a patient Bearing of the Cross.

Self-denial. The necessity of self-denial is pointed out by Christ when He says, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me" (Luke 9:23). Without self-denial, following Christ and progressing in ethical development are impossible. For to follow Christ means to go whithersoever He leads and to make His will our sole guide, even though our own natural inclinations prompt us to go some other way. Since our natural will is so often at variance with Christ's (Rom. 7), self-denial is necessary. This means a continued and steadfast refusal to recognize any claims of the natural will upon us, and to submit completely to Christ's. Such a self-denial follows logically upon the fact that as Christians we no longer belong to ourselves, but to Him. We have been bought with a price (1 Cor. 6:20), and have voluntarily surrendered ourselves to Christ by faith. Hence our business is to glorify God in our body and spirit. Any conflict between Christ's will and our own must be settled in favor of His. To serve both God and the flesh or the world is impossible (Matt. 6:24).

In order to remain in the fellowship with God, the Christian must turn a deaf ear to the promptings of the old sinful self, subdue his sinful passions, and, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, must live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world (Tit. 2:12). He must crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts (Gal. 5:24), let the love of Christ constrain him in all that he does (2 Cor. 5:14), and bring his whole being and conduct into harmony with God's will. Denial of self has a deeper meaning than is often supposed. It does not mean simply the surrender of a pleasure or indulgence now and then, or the making of a sacrifice here and there for the sake of some religious end, but the complete denial or setting aside of self, so that its wishes, desires and promptings receive no consideration at our hands, and the doing of God's will is our only aim.

The full significance of Christ's demand for self-denial may be seen by a reference to Peter's denial of the Lord. The same word for "deny" is used by Christ in foretelling Peter's denial as in demanding self-denial from His followers. What Peter did to Christ is what the believer should do to himself. Self-denial involves, therefore, the saying to the old sinful self, "I know thee not; I have nothing to do with thee. My whole business is to serve God in holiness and righteousness."

The ideal of Christian living thus set before us is that to which Paul gives expression when he says, "Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me" (Gal. 2:20).

Self-denial involves the giving up of everything which would hinder us from faithfully following Christ. Hence it includes not only abstention from everything that is sinful, no matter how great its attraction may be, but also the giving up of that which in itself is innocent, if it exposes us to temptation and threatens to imperil our fellowship with God (Matt. 5:29). Pleasures, possessions and even our near relatives must be parted from, if genuine faithfulness to Christ requires it (Matt. 10:37; Luke 14:26). Self-denial is necessary for self-preservation. It is also at times a duty which we owe to our fellow men. For love of our neighbor greatly restricts our liberty in regard to things which are in themselves lawful (1 Cor. 10:23). The Christian has great need here of the virtue of wisdom that he may properly determine just what is and what is not expedient for him and edifying for others.

The exercise of self-denial is, as is well known, a fundamental necessity for success in any of the walks of life. Self-indulgence can only lead to failure and ultimate ruin. The business-man, the scholar, the physician, the lawyer, the artist, the musician, not to speak of the racer and the boxer to whom Paul refers as examples (1 Cor. 9:25-27), must all deny themselves in many ways and give up countless indulgences, if they would attain real success in their work. All these deny themselves for the sake of earthly rewards. What the Christian is striving for is worth immeasurably more. The necessity for self-denial on his part should, therefore, appear to him not only as inevitable but as something which he will do cheerfully in view of the end to be attained (1 Cor. 9:25).

The specific acts of self-denial required of Christians will vary with their temperament and disposition, their habits, their vocation and their environment. Duty, as we have seen, varies with the circumstances and the individuals. Our ease, convenience, pleasure and profit may at various times need to be sacrificed, if we would do our duty to God, ourselves and our neighbor. We should cheerfully do whatever true love to God and our neighbor requires, even though so doing involves us in real hardships. In love to us and a desire to do His Father's will Christ set aside His own ease, comfort, pleasure and honor among men, and trod the thorny road that led to Calvary. "For the joy that was set before Him He endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down on the right hand of God" (Heb. 12:2). And it is the thought of the end to be attained which should encourage the Christian to make every needful self-denial and sacrifice. All the hardships involved in a life of faithfulness to God are not worthy to be compared with the gracious reward which will be given (Rom. 8:18).

Temptation. The salvation of the Christian is the free gift of God's grace; but he must defend his possession of it by resisting temptation. He must work out his own salvation with fear and trembling (Phil. 2:12), fight the good fight of faith (1 Tim. 6:12), and hold fast what he has that no man take his crown (Rev. 3:11). He must endure to the end if he would be saved (Matt. 24:13), and fight to the uttermost, even to a martyr's death (Heb. 12:4). And his fighting must not be in a self-chosen way, but according to God's will (2 Tim. 2:4, 5). The issue at stake is the eternal welfare of his soul, without which the gain of everything else is futile (Mark 8:36, 37).

Temptations come from the flesh, the world and the devil. They must be at once and steadfastly resisted. Temptation in itself is not sin; for Christ was tempted (Matt. 4:1). But unless temptation is resisted it will lead to sin. The nature and strength of the temptation depends on the character of the individual and his surroundings. But it is always sufficiently strong in the case of every person to require the utmost exertion of the strength he derives from God to overcome. Watchfulness is necessary, because temptation comes at unexpected times and in unexpected ways (Matt. 26:41). The victory will be worth more than all the cost of the conflict (1 Cor. 9:25).

The most dangerous foe of the Christian is the flesh—the old evil nature of sin which persists in him in spite of his regeneration. This old nature with its natural inclination to evil makes him extremely susceptible to the temptations of the world and the devil. It must be fought against and subdued. Our members which are upon the earth must be mortified (Col. 3:5), and the flesh with its affections and lusts must be crucified (Gal. 5:24). Our members must not be yielded as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but as instruments of righteousness unto God (Rom. 6:13). Among the particular sins of the flesh may be enumerated: lust, gluttony, drunkenness, dishonesty, greed, laziness, deceit, malice, envy and hatred.

The second great source of temptation for the Christian is the world, that is, the unchristian people in the world. The world is hostile to God, and seeks to alienate the Christian from his allegiance to God. The Christian's attitude toward the world is not to be one of monastic or eremitic seclusion; for he has his place and calling in the world; but he is not to be of it (John 17:15, 16), and is to keep himself unspotted from it (James 1:27). He is to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but is to reprove them (Eph. 5:11). He must not permit the sinful indulgences of the world nor a devotion to its gains, ambitions and honors to disrupt or even to cloud his fellowship with God. He must not permit its unkind or unjust treatment of him to hurry him into actions which conflict with his love to God and his fellow men (Heb. 12:3). The great number of those who lead worldly lives (Matt. 7:13, 14) must not influence him to follow their example (Exod. 23:2).

The third foe of the Christian is the devil, who is a person, and not an evil principle in man. He is a liar and murderer from the beginning (John 8:44), he beguiled Eve by his subtlety (Gen. 3:4), and he seeks to corrupt the minds of the Christians from the simplicity which is in Christ (2 Cor. 11:3). He employs the flesh and the world for his wicked purposes, and uses every means which offers a prospect of inciting the Christian to evil. He comes sometimes as a roaring lion to intimidate (1 Pet. 5:8), but more often he transforms himself into an angel of light and poses as a friend (2 Cor. 11:14; Gen. 3:4, 5; Matt. 4:3) in order to deceive us into wrongdoing. In the last analysis, the conflict which the Christian wages is a conflict against the devil (Eph. 6:12), because he is behind the temptations of the flesh and the world. In the great warfare between good and evil, truth and falsehood, God and Satan, the Christian must fight on the side of God. He is a soldier of the Cross.

Temptations are trials of our faith. They test us as to whether we will be faithful or not. In the passages in which the Scriptures speak of God as tempting anyone, the word does not mean a seeking to induce men to sin, but a trying or testing. Thus God tested Abraham (Gen. 22:1). But when Satan tempts, it is for the purpose of inducing men to sin. God permits Satan's temptations in order that that which the evil one intends for men's destruction may result in the confirmation of their faith.

God cannot tempt anyone to sin (James 1:13); and when we pray "Lead us not into temptation" (Matt. 6:13), we pray that God may not permit us to be brought into a situation in which our state of grace is imperiled. This petition is necessary, because while the spirit is willing the flesh is weak (Matt. 26:41). The more the sensuous temptations fail to affect the Christian, the more Satan brings to bear upon him spiritual temptations—assaults upon his state of grace, doubts as to God's mercy and promises, and attempts to lead him to despondency and despair. Luther suffered much from this form of temptation.

The Christian should pray for God's help and strength in temptation, with the assurance that, if he does his part, God will not suffer him to be tempted above his strength, but will enable him to overcome (Heb. 2:18; 1 Cor. 10:13). The means which he must employ diligently in order to overcome temptation are the Word of God and prayer. If he faithfully employs these, temptation will serve to purify his faith, to strengthen it, and to promote his increasing sanctification.

The Cross. It is the duty of the Christian to bear his cross. It is an obligation which, along with that of self-denial, rests upon all who would follow Christ (Matt. 16:24). The Savior's warning is, "He that taketh not his cross and followeth after me is not worthy of me" (Matt.

10:38). Bearing the cross does not mean simply enduring the disappointments, sorrows, pains and afflictions of life, but bearing them cheerfully as a burden which God for His own wise purposes permits to rest upon us. To bear afflictions simply because we cannot escape them and without having a Christian attitude toward them is not bearing the cross. Even unbelievers cannot help but endure many pains and sorrows in life. The Christian bears them willingly in submission to a kind Father's will and with the assurance that in God's loving providence they are meant for his final good.

Many sufferings and afflictions come upon the believer. His faith in Christ does not provide him exemption from the troubles of life. He finds himself called upon to endure not only the troubles which are common to men but many additional ones which are the direct or indirect result of his allegiance to Christ. What is his duty in regard to them? He is to bear them in a Christian spirit; they are his cross.

The Biblical teaching plainly is that pain and suffering are the result of the fall into sin. And since all men are sinners, no human being escapes affliction (Job 5:7). If there were no sin, there would be no sickness, pain and death. This is the plain teaching of Scripture, whatever a naturalistic philosophy may teach to the contrary. And any determination of the Christian's attitude toward the sorrows of life must take that fact into account. There is, therefore, in the sufferings of the impenitent and unbelieving a punitive factor. They are suffering only the due reward of their deeds. The wages of sin is death in the widest sense of the term, including every evil of life. But while suffering is thus to be regarded as the result of sin, care must be taken not to ascribe to other persons greater sin because they happen to endure greater afflictions. The occurrence of special catastrophies such as fires, earthquakes and floods, by which certain persons suffer or perish, or a succession of calamities visited upon a certain person or family, is not to be regarded as evidence that the persons concerned are more sinful than others. The Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices, and the eighteen upon whom the tower of Siloam fell were not sinners above others. Job not only was not a greater sinner but was a more godly man than his contemporaries, even though his afflictions far outweighed theirs.

Fundamental to the formulation of the Christian's duty with respect to the trials of life is the recognition of the fact that by faith in Christ his sins are all fully forgiven, and that in his case afflictions are not to be regarded as a punishment. God cannot at one and the same time forgive us our sins and punish us for them. Hence, while it is true in general that suffering is the result of sin, the afflictions of the believers are not a punishment for sin but a chastening and correction by a loving Father who desires further to purify his children from the dross of earth and confirm them in their fellowship with Him. This does not imply, of course, that when the sinner is forgiven all the temporal consequences of his sins are removed also. Repentance does not undo a deed, restore a wasted patrimony, nor repair a broken constitution. But where such consequences of forgiven sins remain they are to be regarded as serving as a wholesome warning against further transgression, and as a helpful discipline in humility, distrust of self, and dependence on God's grace. When special afflictions come upon the Christian he will do well to inquire into the state of his own heart and life, whether there are not in him tendencies which God by affliction means to have him recognize and correct, lest they land him in spiritual shipwreck. That the Christian frequently needs the corrective influence of affliction he should be the first to acknowledge. To deny it would be to show ignorance of the possibilities of evil which still lurk in his own heart. He is constantly in danger of being alienated from God by the natural tendencies of his own heart and the powerful influence of evils which surround him.

Afflictions, therefore, are not to be regarded by the Christian as a sign of God's wrath but of His love. God is aiming so to lead him through things temporal that he finally loses not the things eternal. For whom the Lord loveth He correcteth, even as the father the son in whom he delighteth (Prov. 3:12; Heb. 12:6). As many as Christ loves He rebukes and chastens, that they may be zealous and repent (Rev. 3:19). For the Christian, afflictions are "blessings in disguise." The love of God permits them to come upon him for good and wise purposes. The Christian's duty is, therefore, to regard his life as in God's hands and all its events under His control, and consequently to bow in meek submission to the will of Him who knows best when to send happiness and when to send sorrow. He should, when affliction comes, bear it patiently as a cross which God has laid upon him, believing that God by means of the cross seeks to develop in him a greater faith and love and other Christian graces. For the promise is that all things shall work together for good to them that love God (Rom. 8:28).

The disciples were loved by God because they loved Christ (John 16:27), and Christ loved them even unto the end (John 13:1); yet heavy crosses were laid upon them. Their lives were full of tribulations; they wept and lamented while the world rejoiced (John 16:20), and they endured manifold persecutions (2 Cor. 4:8, 9). But they bore their cross patiently and cheerfully, glorying in tribulation, knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God was shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost (Rom. 5:3-5). Their example is one for us to emulate. We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God (Acts 14:22); and unless we bear our cross we are not worthy of Christ (Matt. 10:38). It is true, "no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby" (Heb. 12:11). The branch that bears fruit in the vine must be purged, that it may bring forth more fruit (John 15:2).

The process through which God puts the Christian by means of suffering of one kind or another is that of refining and purification. So the gold is put through the fire that it may be refined of the dross, and the diamond is ground and polished that it may shine resplendent. Clouds and rain are as essential to the steady growth of the plant as sunshine. The bitter medicine and the sharp knife of the surgeon are the means of restoration to health.

It is one of the functions of faith to trust God even when we do not understand His ways. Many of his dealings with us as His children remain and are bound to remain mysterious to us here in this world. It is evident that His ways are not our ways nor our thoughts His thoughts. The Christian entrusts his paths to God, and believes that the mysteries of life will be made clear in the world to come. Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face. But this we know, that if we would be joint heirs with Christ, we must suffer with Him that we may also be glorified together (Rom. 8:17). His life was one long bearing of the cross, a lifelong, patient endurance of all the hardships and sufferings that came upon Him as He faithfully trod the path of duty. He murmured not nor complained, but courageously bore every burden, and endured every pain, dying at last upon the cross in obedience to the Father's will of redemption. His example is for our imitation (1 Peter 2:21).

Among the crosses to be borne by the Christian are sometimes found painful persecution and even martyrdom. In the early days of the Church and in the period of the Reformation thousands of Christians died as martyrs to their faith. The spread of religious tolerance in most countries has made Christian martyrdom a comparatively rare occurrence. But events in Russia have shown that martyrdom is still a possibility for the Christian. In Christian lands persecution generally takes other forms than physical violence. He who stands up for the right will often find ridicule and maledictions heaped upon him. These must be borne as part of the Christian's cross.

Martyrdom is the climax of the cross. The believer will be ready, if need be, to attest his faith by his death. But martyrdom is not to be regarded as a meritorious act by which to merit salvation. Salvation is still by grace alone, even though we die in Christ's cause.

Self-development. The Christian's duty of self-development is that of so cultivating his spiritual and ethical nature that his faith may be more firmly established (Col. 2:6, 7), his love constantly increased (Phil. 1:9), and his life abound in good works (2 Cor. 9:8). He is to build himself up on his most holy faith (Jude 20) along with his fellow Christians as a spiritual house (1 Peter 2:5). Without constant inward and outward progress his spiritual life will be arrested, decay and finally die. Hence preachers themselves are exhorted to watch, not only over their hearers and over the doctrine, but over themselves (Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 4:16). In seeking to develop his spiritual and ethical self and thus to fit himself ever better for the performance of his duties in life, the Christian may practice Christian Asceticism, and should engage in Christian Meditation.

Asceticism. Christian asceticism in the sense in which the word is used here must be distinguished from the asceticism of the monk and the hermit. The Greek word *askesis*, from which the words ascetic and asceticism are derived, means practice or exercise, especially that of the athlete. It consisted in the use of prescribed exercises whose purpose was to develop strength and endurance and thus to make the athlete efficient as a boxer, a runner and the like. It was not an end, but a means to an end. In considering Christian asceticism, this fundamental meaning of the word must be borne in mind. Any ascetic practices in which a Christian may engage are not an end in themselves but a means to an end. They have no more value in themselves than exercising with dumb-bells, Indian clubs and similar athletic devices. In so far as they have any value at all, it consists in the fact that they develop the powers of body and mind so that these become more responsive and obedient organs or instruments of the new regenerate nature for the fulfillment of duty. They consist in the observance of certain self-appointed rules and regulations which the Christian believes will give him, as it were, a certain desirable spiritual muscular development. It takes two forms, negative and positive. Negatively it consists in practicing such abstinences as will help to keep the psychophysical nature in check and make it subservient to the higher spiritual nature. Positively it consists of an effort by means of certain self-prescribed exercises to train the powers of body and mind to prompt obedience. The immediate purpose of such asceticism is, therefore, not the doing of good, but the fitting of ourselves for the doing of good when occasion demands it. The value of ascetic practices must be judged from this standpoint. In themselves they are not good works; there is no command of God that men should do them; they have no intrinsic value. They are useful only if they enable us to live in closer fellowship with God in love, and enable us better to do our various duties. The notion that sensuous things are in themselves sinful, and that ascetic abstinence is a virtue in itself is a perversion of the true evangelical idea.

Asceticism is a phenomenon of nearly all heathen religions, and was frequently practiced in extreme forms. It early found its way into the Christian Church accompanied by the idea that it constituted a good work and possessed meritorious value. It was practiced by the hermits and monks; and these often sought to outdo one another in almost suicidal treatment of themselves. The Roman Catholic Church still teaches that ascetic exercises are in themselves holy and meritorious, and indeed that they are expiatory. This doctrine, so plainly at variance with that of justification by faith, was rejected by the Reformers.

Extreme asceticism finds no countenance in Scripture. Christ was no ascetic. While the Christian is not to make provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof (Rom. 13:14), he is not to hate his own flesh but to care for it (Eph. 5:29). And while he is not to walk in rioting and drunkenness, in chambering and wantonness (Rom. 13:13), either actually or in imagination, he is not to force upon himself arbitrary prohibitions and abstinences (Col. 2:20-23). Every creature of God is good, if it be received and employed in the proper manner (1 Tim. 4:4). On the other hand the Christian is not to come under the power of any earthly objects or of his natural self (1 Cor. 6:12). His spiritual nature is to maintain the control.

In the positive form of Christian asceticism the principal means of self-training consists of the adoption of rules to be observed in the matter of attending public worship, partaking of the Lord's Supper, reading the Bible, engaging in prayer, and regulating the outward life with its work and recreation. In the negative form the means of self-discipline consists of voluntary abstinence from food, drink, enjoyment and the like. This abstinence, however, may in some cases be more than a means of self-training and discipline, and may be a direct duty to guard against exposing ourselves to temptation or against giving offence to others. The positive form of Christian asceticism has been called spiritual gymnastics; and the negative form, spiritual dietetics.

The adoption or non-adoption of ascetic exercises lies within the sphere of Christian liberty. Those who adopt ascetic measures for themselves must be careful not to seek to force their views and practices upon others, or to regard such ascetic exercises as a standard or mark of Christian virtue.

Christian Meditation has value as an aid to the deepening of the spiritual life, the strengthening of faith, and the increase of love to God. Withdrawing himself for a period from the distractions and cares of his daily activities, the Christian calls to mind the works of God in Creation, Providence, and Redemption, and meditates upon them in the light of Holy Scripture. His aim is not simply to gain more knowledge, but more particularly to renew and vitalize the knowledge which he already possesses, and to have the great realities of his faith make a deeper inpression upon his soul. By means of meditation he is enabled in critical seasons to regain his spiritual perspective, to view things in their proper relations, and to give a new impulse to his spiritual life. Meditation naturally leads on to prayer.

For the purpose of meditation, solitude is important. Christ frequently withdrew himself from the crowd (Matt. 14:23; Mk. 1:35, 45; 6:32). Luther doubted the wisdom of solitude for the young, who crave society. Periods of meditation are important for all Christians, and especially for pastors, who are to be spiritual leaders. They should find time for it in spite of the demands made on their time by the varied activities of their calling. Actual solitude in the sense of physical seclusion is not absolutely essential, since even in a crowded place one may be alone with his thoughts.

Meditation may and sometimes should lead to introspection. The Christian is exhorted to examine himself whether he be in the faith (2 Cor. 13:5); and he is particularly to examine himself before going to the Lord's Supper. But this introspection must not be permitted to become morbid. While we look at and mourn over our sins, we should chiefly look to Christ our Savior who so graciously forgives us our sins and showers so many benefits upon us. The aim of meditation should be to strengthen our faith in God's love and grace, and to deepen our sense of obligation to Him.

CHAPTER XVII

THE FAMILY

THE duties to our fellow men are best considered under the head of the Family, the Church, the State, and Society in General. In this chapter we shall consider the family.

Its Importance. The Family is naturally the first among the social groups of men. Adam and Eve and their children constituted the first family, and all their social relations were found in that group. History shows that the family was the primitive form of society, and that promiscuity has not prevailed to any considerable extent even among people of the lowest culture. The family was necessary for the preservation both of the life of the mother and of the child. It is a divinely appointed institution, constituted by God when He gave Adam and Eve to one another to be man and wife, and told them to increase and multiply. The integrity of the family is of the utmost importance to the individual, the Church, the State, and society in general. It has played a most important part in the development and maintenance of religion and morality. And history gives evidence that civilization itself stands or falls according as the family is held in honor or despised.

For the individual the family means parental care till the child reaches maturity; the transmission of property from one generation to another; the handing down of traditions, customs, ideals, religion and morality; and early training in these fundamental social virtues which later need to be exercised in the wider sphere of human society in general. For the Church the family is an auxiliary of the highest order for the inculcation of moral and religious truth and the practical training in faith and life. For the State the family is indispensible in the preparation of the young for good citizenship. And for society in general the family must be relied upon as the nurturing place of those virtues which alone will make the social relations of men tolerable. Other agencies for the care and the training of children, such as orphanages and similar institutions, are only substitutionary; and still others, such as the Sunday-school, the parish-school and the like are supplementary. The Christian life is to be lived and developed first of all in the family, in the right ethical relation between husband, wife, father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister and other members of the household.

The Greeks regarded man chiefly from the standpoint of the State, and underestimated the value of the family. Plato in his *Republic* advocated as the ideal an eugenically supervised promiscuity and the abolition of the family, because he believed that this procedure would produce the best citizens. Aristotle regarded man as essentially a political being. But the Bible emphasizes the family and makes it prominent from the beginning. The history of the race begins with a family, and throughout the Old Testament the family holds a prominent place. The families of Noah and of Abraham stand at the beginning of new historical developments. Israel as a nation is the family of Jacob. The Savior was of the house and lineage of David, lived in a family, and was obedient to the authorities in it. Christianity found its way into families and thence into society and the nations as a whole. Paul and Peter both emphasize the importance of the family (Eph. 5:22; 6:1; Col. 3:18; 1 Pet. 3:1). In its false exaltation of the celibate state the Roman Catholic Church underestimated the importance of the family; but Luther and the other reformers reasserted its dignity and value as a divinely ordained relationship.

Marriage and Celibacy. Marriage is the normal state; celibacy, the exception. Celibacy may be justified and may even become a duty under certain circumstances, such as ill-health, lack of income, obligation to support near relatives, lack of love for a person of the opposite sex, or a particular obligation to the Kingdom of God. It does not, however, constitute a higher or ideal Christian state; and it is ethical only if it is accompanied by personal control over the sensuous nature. Not all have the gift of celibacy, and those who do not have it should marry (1 Cor. 7:9). Ordinarily marriage is a duty to the race, to the Kingdom of God, and to self: to the race, because the continued orderly propagation of the race is based on marriage; to the Kingdom of God, because the family is to be a center of religious influence; and to self, because the individual is to attain a well-rounded ethical development through the family.

Roman Catholic exaltation of celibacy is based upon a misinterpretation of Scripture and a false asceticism. The self-control demanded by Matthew (19:12) as a duty to the Kingdom may be required of the married as well as the single. The seventh chapter of First Corinthians, in which Paul seems to exalt the celibate state, must be interpreted in the light of other declarations of St. Paul, such as that in Ephesians (5:22 seq.), in which he compares the relation of husband to wife with that of Christ to the Church. That chapter in Corinthians was written in view of the trying circumstances in which the Christians then found themselves, and in which they would be less burdened and be freer to serve Christ if they were unmarried. It implies that with a change of circumstances the expediency of the unmarried state would cease. That Paul does not underrate marriage is evident from the fact that he urges it upon bishops (1 Tim. 3:2), and describes the prohibition of marriage as an antichristian error (1 Tim. 4:3). All celibacy which is chosen as a supposedly holier state, or on account of false standards of living, or for the sake of ease and independence is to be condemned.

Marriage. Monogamy has been the most prevalent form of marriage in all ages. The practically equal number of the sexes in any normal society naturally inclines to monogamy as the proper form of marriage. Where polygamy is found it is largely confined to the rulers and the wealthy classes, since the poor man cannot afford an expensive establishment. While polygamy has been practiced among people of all degrees of culture, and has been sanctioned by Mohammedanism and Mormonism, its general tendency is to disappear with advancing stages of civilization. Aside from the authority of the Christian religion and the biological necessity involved in the practically equal division of the sexes, monogamy possesses such manifest social and cultural advantages as to make it altogether the natural type of marriage. In the care and upbringing of children and the cultivation of the social virtues it is the only type adapted to higher states of culture.

The Christian Ideal of Marriage is set forth in connection with the original divine institution of marriage (Gen. 2:18 seq.), and is emphasized by Christ in His reply to the Pharisees concerning divorce (Matt. 19:4-6; Mark 10:6-9). It is the union for life of one man and one woman in mutual love and faithfulness. They are one flesh; and what God has joined together no man may put asunder. In its true nature marriage is monogamous and indissoluble. Polygamy, though practiced in Old Testament times and by the heathen, is contrary to the divine order as established in the beginning. It ignores the equal value of woman as a person, and makes of her only a chattel of man and a means for the gratification of lust. Christianity has restored marriage to its original state as monogamous, and has given to woman the place which belongs to her as a free ethical personality and as a fellow heir of the grace of life (1 Pet. 3:7).

The New Testament deals with monogamous marriage as an established institution; and the only direct references to it in the Gospels are found in the Lord's declarations concerning divorce (Matt. 5:32; 19:4-6; Mark 10:11, 12; Luke 16:18). The Epistles contain practical exhortations concerning the duties of married persons, as husband, wife and parents. Husband and wife are bound to one another for life, and death alone frees from the bond (Rom. 7:2-3). Unbelief on the part of husband or wife forms no valid ground for separation (1 Cor. 7:12, 13). Marriage is honorable in all (Heb. 13:4), and to avoid fornication every man should have his own wife and every woman have her own husband; and each should render to the other due benevolence (1 Cor. 7:2-9). Wives are to submit themselves unto their own husbands as it is fit in the Lord, and husbands are to love their wives and not be bitter against them (Col. 3:18, 19). The husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church (Eph. 5:23).

The married state has been instituted for the promotion of human happiness (Gen. 2:18), for the orderly propagation of the race (Gen. 1:27), and for the proper care and upbringing of the children with which the conjugal union is blessed (Eph. 6:4). But for the attainment of these ends of marriage the exercise of a great deal of care and foresight is necessary in the choice of a life partner, and the constant practice of many conjugal and parental virtues is required after the married state has been entered upon. The wrecking of many a family is directly traceable to the thoughtlessness and even frivolity with which entrance upon the matrimonial state was undertaken, or to the lack of mutual love, unselfishness, patience and forbearance after marriage.

Care in the Choice of a Life Partner. In view of the importance of marriage in its bearing upon the temporal and eternal welfare and happiness of the parties concerned, and in view of the indissoluble character of the marriage bond, it is evident that marriage should not be entered upon lightly or thoughtlessly, but in the fear of God. The Christian certainly should seek divine aid and guidance in the selection of a life partner. And at the same time that he prays God to guide him, he should use his own reason and common sense, and not let himself be carried away by temporary infatuation into a marriage that lacks many or all the requisites for a happy family life. A man and a woman may both possess many excellencies of body, mind and heart, and yet they may be utterly unsuited to be life partners for one another. Marriage is not merely a physical but a personal relationship, and requires mental and spiritual adjustment and sympathy.

The true married life is built up on a genuine and enduring mutual love, sympathetic understanding, and a fundamental oneness of ideals. It is hard to see how, for example, the marriage of those whose intelligence is of an entirely different grade, or whose views on religion are poles apart, or whose ideals and aims are antagonistic and irreconcilable shall ever lead a happy married life. Even the marriage of a man and a woman both of whom are real Christians may be a mistake, because they are utterly unsuited to one another on account of difference in temperament, family or educational background, religious or ethical views, and the like. It is to be remembered, as has been said by some one, that the grace of God can get along with some persons with whom we cannot. Married life to endure happily must have a sufficient basis in common beliefs and ideals, and must result in a multitude of compromises and concessions on the part of man and wife on many points in which no real principle is involved. All of which is comparatively easy if there be genuine love on the part of husband and wife, but impossible if mutual love and consideration be wanting.

Marriages between Christians and atheists, or Christians and heathen, or Christians and Jews, present such fundamental divergencies of belief as to make a really happy marriage practically impossible. Marriage between a white person and one of another color is a social offense and brings ostracism. The marriage of a Protestant and a Roman Catholic is not calculated to produce happiness. It means a religiously divided family, and presents serious difficulties in connection with the religious training of the children. The insistence of the priest that the marriage ceremony shall be performed by him and that otherwise it will not be a real marriage, and the requirement that all the offspring of such a marriage shall be brought up in the Roman Catholic Church, are demands to which an earnest Protestant cannot consent. The further fact that the Roman Catholic party to the marriage is taught that he is in danger of eternal destruction, unless he carries out the instructions of the priest in these and other respects, has driven many a family upon the rocks. The marriage of Protestants of different denominations is less perilous, but unless they agree to become members of the same Church the religious situation will be far from ideal. Even among Protestants there are differences of doctrine and of ethical views which are not by any means utterly negligible, and which may cause considerable argument and even dissension unless there is the exercise of great wisdom and patience by husband and wife.

Harmony of Beliefs and Ideals. The ideal marriage is one in which, along with some difference of views and opinions on non-essential points, there is harmony in fundamental beliefs, ideals, aims and purposes. Being a union in the tenderest of all bonds, those of love, right marriage represents a harmonious and sympathetic coöperation in the building of a happy Christian home. Without such a harmony of beliefs, ideals and strivings as will furnish a common ground of mutual interests, both temporal and spiritual, and as will promote an increasing mutual love and esteem, infatuation will give way to indifference, apathy and disgust, and the couple will be engaged in ceaseless bickerings and possibly land in the divorce court.

Love Essential. It is evident that marriage should be for love and not for other considerations. The times are not propitious for any attempts on the part of parents to force their children into alliances which are distasteful to them. In these days children are quite apt to insist that marriage is their own affair, and that the parents have little or nothing to say. While there is some truth in such assertions, inasmuch as it is not the parents but the young persons themselves who will have to live in the bonds of the proposed marriage, yet it must be maintained that even in these days the parents' advice may often be of great value, and their blessing is something not to be despised. Marriages without love, and entered upon for financial or social advantages or to please somebody or even to spite some one, are not altogether unknown; but they give little promise of happiness, and are almost certain to make shipwreck. Temporary infatuation has hurried many persons into marriage with an unsuitable partner, when every consideration of common sense and prudence warned against it. In view of all these facts it is not to be wondered at that many families are filled with dissension, and that the divorce courts are crowded. Then, too, marriages often turn out unhappily because of outside interference on the part of parents-in-law or other relatives. Here every married person needs to bear in mind what the Scriptures say, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave unto his wife" (Matt. 19:5).

The solemnization of a marriage by the Church is, of course, not essential to its validity, and marriage by the civil magistrate is binding. Marriage is not a sacrament, as the Roman Catholic Church maintains; but the Christian will certainly desire the blessing of God upon the union into which he enters, and will seek the blessing which God pronounces through the ordained minister of the Church. That the minister in marrying a couple shall take particular pains to obey the marriage laws of the state is understood. But to be true to his calling he will have to pay attention to other considerations beside the civil law, such for example as the Church's rulings on divorce and remarriage, and the laws of consanguinity (Lev. 18).

Marriage is for life. In case of the death of one of the married persons, the other is free to marry again if he sees fit to do so. The advisability of a second or even a third marriage must be decided by the individual. The early Church regarded second marriages with disfavor; but its opposition was without real Scriptural warrant.

Divorce. Since the marriage tie is by God's own ordination indissoluble (Matt. 19:3 seq.; Mark 10:11, 12; Luke 16:18), it cannot, except through death, be dissolved or broken without sin. If a divorce takes place, either there has been a previous sinful breaking of the marriage bond which justifies divorce as a legal declaration of that fact, or else the divorce itself constitutes a sinful breaking of the bond. Where both parties to the marriage are real Christians the tie will never be broken. Where married persons continue to love and esteem one another and treat one another with consideration, sympathy and unselfishness, a divorce will never be sought. The only permissible ground of divorce mentioned by our Lord is that of adultery (Matt. 5:32; 19:9). Since the adultery itself constitutes a breaking of the marriage covenant, the innocent party is entitled to seek a divorce. Some persons maintain that this does not justify another marriage on the part of the innocent party, but only confers a permanent legal freedom from the obligations of the first marriage. But there does not seem to be any valid reason for denying the right to another marriage to the innocent one, if without his or her fault the first marriage has been actually and legally dissolved. The words of the Lord in Matthew 19 do not make a divorce obligatory. In case of repentance on the part of the guilty one the innocent party may forgive the transgressor and renew the conjugal relationship.

The Roman Catholic Church denies the possibility of divorce at all, and allows only a separation *a mensa et thoro.* It makes considerable use of the theory, however, that certain marriages have been invalid from their inception, and may be annulled. Others have argued that, in view of the fact that in Mark's and Luke's account of the Lord's words (Mark 10:11, 12; Luke 16:18) no exception is made in the case of adultery, the Lord really forbids all divorce. But Mark and Luke do not contradict the statements in Matthew; they simply contain a declaration of the morally unbreakable relationship of marriage, while Matthew states in addition that adultery as well as death represents an *ipso facto* breaking of the marriage bond.

It has been the general position of Lutheran theologians that on the basis of 1 Corinthians 7:15 willful and malicious desertion forms an additional valid ground for a divorce. Such willful and malicious desertion breaks up the marriage effectually and renders the conjugal relationship impossible. Hence it forms a valid ground for the seeking of a divorce by the deserted party. Unless this were so, the deserter would have it in his power utterly to nullify the matrimonial covenant, and yet at the same time hold the innocent party perpetually in bondage. Hence Paul says a brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases; in other words he is free from an obligation which the other party willfully persists in making unfulfillable. The fact that the deserter referred to by Paul is supposed to be a heathen is due to the apostle's assumption that a Christian would not be guilty of such desertion. The possibility of divorce for willful and malicious desertion is easily capable of abuse. There may be complicity in the desertion, both parties desiring a divorce. Or the desertion may not really be willful and malicious, though made to appear so by the seeker of a divorce. In reality the so-called innocent party may have acted so cruelly or so diabolically that living with him or her was an impossibility. In such a case the party who deserts is really the innocent party, and the apparently innocent one is really the one who has broken up the marriage. Hence, in the case of a proposed new marriage of a deserted person investigation must be made to discover whether there has really been a malicious desertion or not. It is or ought to be self-evident that the minister can marry divorced persons only when the divorce has been obtained on Scriptural grounds, and then only the innocent party in the divorce.

The laxity of the divorce laws in some of our States and in some foreign countries is notorious. The number of divorces in proportion to the number of marriages is increasing constantly. Many of the grounds on which the divorce is granted are nothing short of frivolous. Still greater ease of divorce is demanded by many persons who view marriage almost wholly from the physical side and who leave the importance of the family and the care and upbringing of the children out of consideration. Marriages are looked upon by many as a sexual experiment, which, if unsatisfactory, may be terminated by the divorce court, and a new experiment be undertaken. The imminent danger with which all this threatens the family and the home, already handicapped by modern industrial conditions and the decentralization of the family, demands that Christians should uphold and contend for the sanctity of marriage, the rights of children to a happy, well-ordered and stable family life, and Christian ideals for the home.

The effect of this multiplication of divorces if continued is bound to be disastrous also to the nation. It is said that for five hundred and twenty years there had not been a single case of divorce in ancient Rome. The family and the State stood firm. But with the moral laxity in sexual matters, the frequency of divorce, and the consequent break-up of the orderly family life which followed the second Punic war, the power of Rome passed its zenith. Her final downfall, as historians agree, was due to her moral disintegration. In view of the laxity of sexual morality advocated by many persons and practiced by many others in our time, the history of Rome stands as a stern warning.

While the Church cannot impose upon the State her conception of what constitutes a proper ground for divorce, and the State is often guided by practical rather than by strictly ethical considerations in the framing of its laws on divorce, it is the duty of the Christian Church to refuse to sanction unscriptural divorces by refusing to marry persons who have been divorced on unscriptural grounds. Incompatibility of temper, religious differences and physical or mental diseases form no Scriptural ground for divorce. The Church can recognize only those grounds which Scripture sets forth.

The Abuse of Sex. Sex is God's provision for the propagation of the race (Gen. 1:27, 28) and for the establishment of the most intimate, sympathetic and satisfying of all earthly companionships in marriage (Gen. 2:18). Gratification of the sexual instinct is by divine command limited to the state of marriage. All sexual relations outside of the married estate are forbidden, as well as all unnatural vices, such as prevailed so largely among heathen nations (Rom. 1:26, 27). Among the Greeks the sexual appetite was practically put on the same level as the appetite for food and drink; and fornication and adultery were not counted as wrong so long as the virtue of moderation was observed. Public courtesans and concubines were regarded as a normal part of the well-to-do Athenian's life. Pederasty was practiced without any feeling of shame. Though some notable characters in the

Old Testament times were guilty of adultery and fornication (Gen. 38:15 seq.; Judges 16:1), these sins as well as sodomy and bestiality are strictly forbidden in the Old Testament (Exod. 20:14; Deut. 23:17; Lev. 20:10 seq.; etc.). The sin of Onan was punished with death (Gen. 38:9, 10). In the New Testament Christ interprets the law against sexual sins as one that reaches back into the heart as the source of all evil lusts, and demands purity of thought as well as of word and deed (Matt. 5:28). The apostle Paul, whose work among the Gentiles brought him face to face with the baleful influence of heathen laxity upon the Christian congregations, presents in his epistles numerous warnings against all sins of uncleanness (1 Cor. 5:1; 6:13; 10:8; Eph. 5:3-5; Col. 3:5; 1 Thess. 4:3-7). The Christian's body is the temple of the Holy Ghost and must not be defiled (1 Cor. 3:16, 17). The sin of fornication is a sin against one's own body as well as against God (1 Cor. 6:15-20).

Sexual sins with their accompaniment of social disorder, divorce and venereal diseases are a peril which threatens the stability of the family and the nation. While legally regulated prostitution might to some extent lessen venereal disease, the Christian cannot sanction it because it would place the stamp of legality on that which constitutes a gross transgression of the moral law. The harm which venereal diseases do to the family and to the future of the race indicates the need of laws to prohibit the marriage of persons afflicted with such diseases, until they are officially pronounced cured.

The fearful prevalence of sexual sins among the young as well as among older persons is a lamentable phenomenon of the day. It has been suggested that the remedy lies in a "companionate marriage." But this so-called remedy discredits the family, reduces marriage to a purely physical basis, and attempts to cure an evil by legalizing it. The real cure must come by a process of Christian education and the inculcation of Christian ideals. Back of these sins lie many contributing causes, among them the defense of moral laxity in sexual matters by some sociological writers, the advocacy of free love, the wide diffusion of knowledge concerning contraceptives, the pagan adoration of the human body and its beauty, the curtailment of feminine attire, the near-nudity and the suggestive scenes of the moving pictures and the stage, the pornographic and near-pornographic magazines, and the smutty realism of many popular novels.

The outlook in the face of so many morally disintegrating influences is far from encouraging. The remedy can lie only in constant emphasis upon the Christian ideals set forth in the Holy Scriptures. Modesty of dress and behavior, purity of thought and imagination, moral cleanness in speech and conduct, and the scrupulous avoidance of all that is contrary to the holy will of God and the Christian's profession of discipleship, together with the resolute setting of mind and heart upon the true, the beautiful and the good, watchfulness against temptation (Matt. 26:41), and the avoidance of evil company, lewd literature and all other incitements to carnal lusts, are enjoined upon the Christian, if he would avoid the pitfalls of sin. Our bodies as well as our souls belong to Christ, and are to be kept pure. We are to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service (Rom. 12:1); and we must not yield them to uncleanness (Rom. 6:13). The apostle's warning is: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness . . . of the which I tell you before as I have told you in times past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:19-21).

Husband and Wife. The Christian marriage will be begun and carried on in the name of the Lord. Henceforth the man and the woman are no longer two but one, united by a common love, living a common life, believing in and serving a common Savior and having common hopes and endeavors, children in common and property in common. In this common life the husband is the head; but it is a headship of love (Eph. 5:22), not of tyranny (Col. 3:19). Christianity has given to woman the place which belongs to her as the personal equal of man, and not his slave or chattel. In Christ there is neither male nor female (Gal. 3:28). Married life is a permanent partnership of love, in which woman is the helpmate of man, and in which each sex is to contribute according to its gifts and endowments to the happiness and success of the partnership.

In the close association of the home when the glamour of the honeymoon has faded and life's problems are to be faced and its burdens to be borne day by day, the love of husband and wife for one another and for the children which God gives them, and their common love for God, are the fundamental requisites for the building up of that happy home life which each anticipates and hopes for. It is the characteristic of love that, where it is strong enough, it furnishes in response to every demand of a situation the specific virtue which is required. The many-sidedness of love, manifested in the desire to please, in kind consideration, in sympathy and understanding, patience, forbearance, long-suffering, self-sacrifice and many other virtues, is needed to enable husband and wife to grow into that mental and spiritual unity which characterizes the happy family.

It is love alone which will make marriage what it is meant to be, and what it has in it the possibilities of becoming. Where love fades and dies married happiness is at an end. For this reason husband and wife should each be constantly intent on retaining one another's love and grounding it on an ever increasing esteem of one another's lovable qualities. They are heirs together of the grace of God (1 Peter 3:7), and they are to be helpful to one another in their Christian life. Together they are to train up their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord. Together they are to bear life's burdens and together taste its joys. Neither is perfect, and neither should expect perfection of the other. They should be appreciative of one another's virtues, lenient toward one another's infirmities, and earnestly endeavor to live together in a Christian spirit of peace and loving concord. Constant insistence upon one's own opinion on the part of husband and wife, and an unwillingness to yield for the sake of peace, arguments over trifles, harshness of words or manner, carping criticism, nagging, keeping spite, and the like are responsible for much unhappiness in married life. Husband and wife should each be concerned to overcome his or her own faults, and should study the happiness of the other. A constant effort to retain the love and respect of the partner of the married life and the avoidance of selfishness are essential to enduring harmony and happiness.

The husband is the provider and protector. It is his part to earn a living for the family. The wife is the mistress of the home, whose qualities as an administrator should be cleanliness, neatness, frugality, and economy. The efforts of an industrious husband to provide ample income can easily be frustrated if the wife is shiftless and extravagant. The wife should receive a stated allowance for her own personal use. It is wise for the husband to let the wife know something of his affairs and how they stand, otherwise she may assume a condition of prosperity which does not exist and spend on too large a scale. The wife on her part should take a sympathetic interest in her husband's work and appreciate the problems he must face out in the world. Sometimes, especially when there are no children, the wife as well as the husband works in an office or elsewhere, and earns an income of her own. There are probably cases where this is necessary for a temporary period; but as a lasting arrangement it is utterly unadvisable, as it makes the building of a real home impossible. Doubtless many married women have talents which would make for success in business, or in art, or on the stage, etc. But in general woman will find that she will have to choose between marriage and a career, and that she cannot do justice to both. Granting to woman the equal political rights which she has now obtained and the equality of opportunity which has also become hers, it still remains true that woman cannot afford to give up or neglect her primary rights, privileges and duties as the bond of union, efficiency and love in the family. Woman's chief privilege and duty are to make a home for her loved ones.

Parents. The relation of parents to their children is one of great authority, but also one of great responsibility. They are God's representatives in the family for the maintenance of law and order; and at the same time they are charged with the care and training of the children. It is an earthly relationship which more than any other reflects the relation of God to the believers, since He is our Father and we are His children. It follows that in dealing with their children parents should have regard to the manner in which God deals with those who are His children in Christ Jesus. The guiding principle is love. In the exercise of parental authority and in the discharge of parental responsibility love should be the determining factor.

The care of the children includes their temporal and spiritual needs. In respect to their temporal wants this means proper care of the body and the health of the child, proper food and clothing, supervision over his daily life and the formation of his habits, training in obedience, the necessary instruction in the home, proper punishment when necessary, and the best education which the talents of the child and the financial ability of the parents will permit. These obligations require of many parents a self-denial which the children are not fully in a position to appreciate, and which they will be able to estimate properly only when later on they are bringing up children of their own. The importance of the mother in the care and training of the children because of her almost constant presence in the home is evident. But the father must shoulder his part of the burden and responsibility also.

The spiritual well-being of their children will always be for Christian parents a matter of the most vital moment. Their religious and ethical training must therefore occupy much of the parent's thought and effort. They should bring their children to God in holy baptism in early infancy, instruct them in the Word of God, bring them to the Bible school and church, and seek to develop in them true Christian faith and life. It is chiefly in the family that the character is molded. While other agencies may assist in the religious and moral training, the primary and principal responsibility rests on the parents. It is for them to train up the child in the way in which he should go, so that when he is old he will not depart from it. They should ceaselessly pray for their children, ask God for wisdom to deal properly with them, patiently instruct them in regard to right and wrong, and give them an example of Christian living which it will be safe for the children to follow. While modern conditions make the holding of family worship difficult in many cases, it should not be neglected. The conscientious efforts of parents to train up their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord will be rewarded in the subsequent conduct of the children (Prov. 22:6). Punishment should not be withheld when necessary, but it should never be inflicted unjustly, in anger, to relieve the parents' feelings, or in an excessive degree. Weak indulgence and failure to restrain children from evil doing will result in bitter experience later (1 Sam. 3:13; 4:11-18). But punishment should be inflicted only in love, and justice often be tempered with mercy.

Children. The duty of children is clearly defined in the decalogue as that of honoring the parents. Paul exhorts children to obey their parents in the Lord; for this is right (Eph. 6:1). And again he exhorts them to obey their parents in all things; for this is well pleasing unto the Lord (Col. 3:20). This obedience will be more easily and more gladly rendered if parents do not provoke their children to wrath (Eph. 6:4; Col. 3:21) by arbitrary and unreasonable commands, harshness of manner and tone, and failure to explain the reason for commands when the child has a right to know not only what he should do but why. True obedience to parents is voluntary, and should spring from love and a desire to please, and should not be arbitrarily exacted by threats, except as a last recourse. The theory long held in certain quarters that a child's will must be broken should be utterly discarded. As well break the child's backbone as break his will. The will is not to be broken, but trained. A strong will properly directed is a precious possession.

In these days it will be impossible for most parents to exact that unquestioning obedience to every command however arbitrary or unreasonable which was exacted in former periods of history; nor is this altogether to be regretted. Parents are not set in the family to be tyrants who need respect no one's rights. At the same time the prevalence of the modern doctrines of "freedom" and the tendency of the young to assert for themselves too large a measure of independence requires of parents an extraordinary measure of wisdom, insight, tact, patience and firmness to inculcate in the young right religious and moral ideals to guide them.

While the duty of obedience ceases when children have reached the age of maturity, the duty of honoring the parents continues. This includes filial care for the parents when they have become old and helpless. The relation between grown-up children and their parents must be guarded against disrespect and ingratitude on the part of the children, and against mistaken efforts on the part of parents to continue their authority and control over their mature sons and daughters. Much mischief is wrought by parents and parents-in-law who meddle in the affairs of young couples.

Family Affection is promoted by the maintenance of the proper authority free from tyranny, the cultivation of respect for the rights of all the members of the family, and an interest on the part of each in the welfare and happiness of all the rest. The home is the place above all others where love and affection should rule. Selfishness, quarrelsomeness, anger, unkindness in words and actions will prevent the home life from possessing that peace and concord which should be its distinguishing mark. Self-control, politeness, consideration for the rights and feelings of others, patience and similar virtues should not be reserved for use outside the family, but should be cultivated, developed and exercised in the home. One of the most beautiful sights on earth is that of a loving and harmonious Christian family.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE CHURCH

The Relation to God. The Christian's relation to the Church is to be placed above all others, because it involves his direct relation to God. In its real essence the Church is the communion of saints or the fellowship of those who believe in Christ. And this fellowship with God through faith in Christ must ever hold the first place in the mind and heart of the Christian. Important and sacred as are his obligations to the family, the State and men in general, his duties to the Church and through it to Christ are paramount. While the duty to love father or mother or son or daughter is a holy obligation, Christ is to be loved more (Matt. 10:37). While subjection to the authority of the State is expressly enjoined (Rom. 13:1), allegiance to God is a higher obligation (Acts 5:29). At God's command Abraham forsook his home and kindred in Chaldea and departed into an unknown country in order to become the ancestor of God's chosen people (Gen. 12:1-4). Moses set his fellowship with God's chosen people above his connection with Pharaoh's court and his obligations and prospects as the son of Pharaoh's daughter (Heb. 11:24, 25). The disciples forsook all and followed Jesus (Mark 10:28-30); and when it became necessary for them to choose between the Church and the good will of their fellow countrymen, they unhesitatingly chose the Church (Acts 5:29; 7:51). Paul loved his own people, the Jews, with a great and mighty love, so that to save them he was willing to be accursed (Rom. 9:3); nevertheless, he sacrificed their good will and endured their enmity and persecution in order to preach the Gospel among the Gentiles and to enjoy with them fellowship with God through faith in Christ. The Puritans, the Huguenots, the Salzburgers, the Germans of the Palatinate and many others left their homes in Europe and braved the terrors of the American wilderness for the sake of their faith. At whatever cost the Christian must serve God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Nature of the Church. A proper conception of the nature of the Church is essential to a formulation of the duties of those who constitute it. The Roman Catholic conceives of the Church as the external hierarchy, and knows nothing of the Church as the invisible communion of saints. The right relation to Christ is supposed to be conditioned on the right relation to the external Roman Catholic Church. Acceptance of her teaching and obedience to her commands constitute the way of salvation for her members. The Reformers rejected this conception of the Church, and found the essential principle of Church-membership in justifying faith. All those who from the heart believe in Christ as their Savior are by virtue of their faith members of the Church. In its essence the Church is not an external organization but a spiritual fellowship. The Church is Christ's body; He is the Head (Eph. 1:22, 23). Believers are vitally united with Him by faith, as the members of the body are united with the head and as the branches are united with the vine (John 15:5). Since the Church consists of the true believers in all the different Churches, denominations and sects in every part of the world, the Christian lives in a spiritual fellowship with all of them. He is united with them through faith in Christ his Savior. In this essential sense the Church of Christ is one. It is a spiritual entity, the fellowship of believers.

But inasmuch as the believers on earth have bodies, it is not correct to speak of the true Church as being only invisible. It is also visible. While no one can tell who the true members of the Church are, the persons who constitute the true Church have bodies and can be seen. They are gathered together in local churches or congregations around the Word of God and the sacraments. Along with them are gathered some persons who are not Christians, but who are tares among the wheat. Thus there exists the empirical Church, or the Church in the mixed condition in which it is found upon earth, and in which it contains believers and unbelievers, both of whom claim membership in it. The unbelievers, however, though enrolled in the empirical Church, are not part of the Church of Christ. Only the true believers are really part of the Church. If we would define the Church, therefore, in so far as it can be seen, it must be defined as the fellowship of believers gathered along with some unbelievers around the Word of God and the sacraments. The Word and the sacraments are the means by which the believers have been brought into the fellowship with God, and at the same time they are the means entrusted to the believers as God's servants for the evangelization of the world.

The duties which devolve upon the Christians with respect to the Church may be regarded under two aspects; namely, the duties which rest upon the Church as such, that is, upon the membership of the Church as a whole; and those which rest upon each Church member as an individual.

The Normative Character of the Holy Scriptures. The first duty of the Church as a whole is to receive and follow the Word of God as its absolutely normative authority. The Holy Scriptures are not to be confused with the divine revelation. The Scriptures are the divinely inspired record of the supernatural revelation. The revelation itself antedated the record of it. Long before the oldest books of the Old Testament were written God had revealed Himself to Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. And a considerable time before the oldest of the New Testament books were written God had revealed Himself through His Son Jesus Christ, and the knowledge of His revelation was spread abroad through the world by the preaching of the apostles. The earliest books of the New Testament were letters written to Christian congregations who had been brought to faith through the oral proclamation of the Gospel. But in the Holy Scriptures the inspired record of revelation is given in permanent form for the guidance and direction of the Church in all ages. These Scriptures are normative for all the teaching of the Church as regards both doctrine and life.

Faithfulness to the Scriptures must be the Church's primary consideration. The test of the true Church is to be found, not in external unity such as Rome demands, nor in any so-called apostolic succession of bishops, nor in any particular form of outward organization, but in the Scripturalness of her teaching. And while it is true that the Church in its essence as the fellowship of believers is one, and that this essential unity ought to be expressed by the external unity of the empirical Church, purity of doctrine and conformity to the teaching of Scripture must always be set above external union. Paul was concerned for the churches among the Galatians and the Colossians; but it was anxiety primarily for the purity of the doctrine proclaimed and not for the external unity of the Church (Gal. 1:6 seq.; Col. 2:1 seq.).

Respect for the normative character of the Old Testament Scriptures is evident in the life and teaching of our Lord and His apostles. Christ quoted Scripture as His guide when He was tempted in the wilderness (Matt. 4:4, 7, 10), used it as the basis of His teaching in the synagogue (Luke 4:16, 17), and called attention to its normative authority (Luke 10:25-26), its testimony concerning Him (John 5:39), and its unbreakable character (John 10:35). His mind was imbued with its teaching, and He quoted frequently from it, and from practically all parts of it with equal confidence in its normative authority. The preaching and teaching of the apostles was grounded in the Old Testament as the Word of God which prepared the way for Christ and prophesied of Him. And it is evident that in the minds of the New Testament churches the matter of prime importance was the maintenance of the pure Gospel as preached by the apostles, and not forms of organization or orders of procedure.

The first and fundamental duty of the Church is, therefore, that of guarding the purity of her teaching, and seeing to it that in all respects it conforms to the Word of God. In matters of practice also the Church must be guided by the Word of God whenever that Word lays down principles or directions. But in practical matters, the Church need not restrict herself to what is directly commanded in the Scriptures, though she must always be on her guard not to adopt customs or practices which are in any way in conflict with them. There is a difference here between the Lutheran Church and the Reformed Churches: the former feeling herself at liberty to retain customs and traditions which are not in conflict with the Scriptures, though not commanded in them; the latter maintaining that everything not commanded in the Scriptures must be rejected. In many things, such as the use of liturgical forms of worship, modern instruments of music and the like, most of the Reformed Churches have receded from the former extreme position.

The Confessions or Creeds are statements of what the Church believes and teaches. They are not normative in the sense in which the Holy Scriptures are normative, but they exhibit the manner in which the Church interprets and understands the Scriptures. They set forth what the ministers of the Church are to teach and preach in her name. Subscription to the confessions of a particular Church by any minister implies that he personally believes what the confessions set forth, and will conform to them in his teaching and preaching. They must not be subscribed to with mental reservations. So long as a Church believes that her confessions properly interpret the Scriptures and correctly exhibit their teachings, so long the Church is morally bound to teach and preach according to her confessions. The hue and cry raised against confessions in these days is utterly unjustified. A Church must believe and teach something; and she herself and the rest of the world have a right to know what doctrines she officially stands for. Ostensibly in many cases the opposition to confessions and creeds is to the form in which the creeds set forth the doctrines believed and taught. In reality the opposition is to the contents of the creed.

That the language in which confessions and creeds are formulated is often that of a bygone age and a superseded philosophy is, indeed, true; but this will not hinder the preachers and teachers of the Church from preaching and teaching the true doctrines in modern and more intelligible terms whenever necessary. To cast the creeds overboard on account of their language would be to cast their doctrines along with the language. And this is exactly what many of the modernists desire. It is not so much the form of the creeds as it is their teaching concerning the deity of Christ and His atonement for human sin that is obnoxious in their eyes. For this reason fidelity to the creeds means for the evangelical Christian fidelity to the Gospel. The deity of Christ and the significance of the cross are at stake. Hence, while confessions are by no means normative for the Church in the sense in which the Holy Scriptures are normative, they are invaluable as the Church's expression of the teaching of the normative Word of God. Those who go forth as ministers of a particular Church are morally bound to preach in conformity with the doctrines contained in her confessions. If they will not do this or cannot do it with a good conscience, they should leave her communion and unite with some other religious body with whose teaching they agree. Common honesty demands this. No one has a right to claim that he represents a Church whose official teaching he repudiates.

The Task of the Church is that of evangelizing the world (Matt. 28:19-20). For this purpose she has been entrusted with the administration of the Word and the sacraments. These are the means through which the Holy Spirit carries on his saving and sanctifying work in the hearts and lives of men. They are the Means of Grace through which the saving grace of God comes to men. The chief means is the Word; for even in the sacrament the Word is the principal thing. But these means through which the Holy Spirit operates must be faithfully administered by the Church. In so far as she fails in any wise to measure up to this duty, the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts and lives of men is impeded and the evangelization of the world is retarded.

The Church must faithfully preach the Word (2 Tim. 4:2), and she must preach it in its purity (Gal. 1:8). It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe (1 Cor. 1:21). Unless she preaches the Word to men, they will not be brought to Christ their Savior (Rom. 10:13-15), nor be built up in the faith (John 17:17). She must preach the real Gospel and not some substitute for it; otherwise men will go about to establish their own righteousness instead of submitting themselves to the righteousness of God (Rom. 10:3).

The Word which she preaches has a power all its own (Heb. 4:12), because it is always accompanied by the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit; but she must not on this account omit anything necessary for the full and powerful proclamation of the Word through the human instruments whom she employs. Her workmen must rightly divide the word of truth (2 Tim. 2:15), preaching law and Gospel in proper proportions, and seeking to meet the particular spiritual needs of the people to whom they are ministering. The burden of her preaching must be, "Repent, believe, and bring forth the fruits of faith." Her aim must be to convert, instruct, warn, comfort and edify. The modes in which she administers the Word are the public preaching in the services of the Church; private instruction, admonition and comfort; Christian education; the work of foreign missions, home missions and inner missions; religious publications; and such other methods of proclaiming evangelical truth as may from time to time be advisable and necessary for the proper prosecution of her work.

The Public Service is indispensable to the Church in her work of converting the sinners and edifying the saints, and of thus enlarging and confirming the fellowship of believers. Since the time of the Reformation, the Word has properly occupied the central place in the public service. The hymns and liturgy lead up to the reading of the Scriptures and the preaching of the sermon; and these again lead up to that highest communion of the believer with God which takes place in the reception of the Holy Supper.

It is the duty of the church to see to it that these services actually subserve the purpose for which they are intended. Hence it is necessary that the services be conducted decently and in order (1 Cor. 14:40); that the order of service approved by the Church be observed by the individual congregation, and no disturbing or unseemly innovations be attempted; and that the sermon be an actual preaching of the Gospel as the offer of salvation for Christ's sake to all who believe, and not a discourse on ethics, politics, philosophy, science or some other such topic. The public service is the Church's greatest opportunity for doing the work with which the Lord has charged her. For here, as her members gather for the common worship of God, she can and should urge a deeper repentance for sin, stronger faith in Christ the Savior, more ardent love for God and the neighbor, a more consecrated Christian life, a larger vision of the Church's opportunities for the service of God and our fellow men, and an ever increasing zeal for the accomplishment of the Church's task.

Religious Education. The education and training of the young in Christian faith and life is not only a duty to which Christ has solemnly obligated the Church (John 21:15), but one on whose fulfillment the whole future well-being of the Church and the nation depends. The separation of the Church and the State in this country makes it impossible for the State to introduce religious instruction in the public schools, and thrusts upon the Church the difficult task of finding adequate ways and means as well as time on the part of the child for supplying the necessary instruction and training in religion. The emphasis which Luther placed upon the religious instruction of the child is one which the Church which is named after him has always in theory firmly upheld. But it is handicapped, as are also the other Churches in this country, by the fact that the public school practically monopolizes the child's available time, and that the machinery necessary for proper religious instruction is disproportionally large compared with the small portion of the child's time which is at the Church's disposal.

From the beginning of her history the Lutheran Church has had a great advantage in the possession of Luther's Small Catechism and the practice of catechetical instruction. And her catechetical instruction remains to this day the means of systematic religious instruction upon which she must place her chief reliance. For here under the care of the pastor himself, the child, on the basis of the catechism, is taught the doctrines of God's Word which are necessary for salvation, and is prepared for full communicant membership in the Church. The catechism itself offers the proper sequence of subjects, in that, as Luther himself pointed out, it does three things: in the Ten Commandments it shows men what ails them, namely, sin; in the Creed it shows them what will cure them, namely, the redemption accomplished by Christ; and in the Lord's prayer it shows them how they may secure this remedy for sin, namely, by prayer. In the catechetical class the pastor therefore has an opportunity to produce, through the operation of the Holy Spirit in the

Word, repentance for sin, faith in Christ the Savior, and the habit of prayer. In the fourth and fifth parts of the catechism he points back to the covenant of grace into which in infancy the children were received by God in baptism, and forward to the Lord's Supper to which they are to be admitted after their confirmation.

In view of the fact that at least some of the children, and often many of them, come to the catechetical class with an inadequate knowledge of that sacred history whose significance is explained in the doctrines of the Church, it becomes necessary for the pastor, if he would make sure to do his work well, to gather the children at a younger age into a junior class, and see to it that a proper foundation of Biblical knowledge is laid there for the catechetical instruction proper. To these two classes the pastor, if he would do all the work which rests upon him as a teacher and evangelist, must add a third class for the instruction of more mature youths and of adults who desire to become members of the Church, but who must first be sufficiently instructed in the doctrines and duties of the Christian religion.

Since the time spent in the pastor's catechetical classes is only a small portion of the life of the child, and the years preceding and following them are of great importance for thorough religious training, it is incumbent upon the Church to find additional means for the religious instruction of the young. The Sunday school or Bible school has long been used by the Church, and is still largely used for lack of something better. Its virtues as well as its deficiencies are well known and need not be elaborated here. But the inadequacy of the Sunday school, due particularly to the lack of sufficient time and the lack of sufficiently trained teachers, makes it necessary for the Church to find some better method of carrying out the Lord's command with regard to the feeding of the lambs.

Needed by the State. The State, though it cannot engage in the teaching of religion, is nevertheless vitally interested in the work of religious instruction. For if the State is ever to stem the tide of crime which is so rapidly rising, it can do so, not by police power alone, but only through the aid it can get from the religious forces of the country and the inculcation by them of sound religious and moral principles in the children and youth of the land. Hence the State has in many places very properly shown a readiness to cooperate as far as possible with the Church by giving up a portion of the public school time for religious instruction by the Church. From the experiments which the Church is making in this matter by holding classes for religious instruction after school hours, by utilizing a portion of the public school period, and by Saturday schools, vacation schools and the like, the Church must seek to discover some generally satisfactory and adequate means of religious instruction and training. No power but that of religion can change the human heart and instill genuine love of righteousness. For her own growth and prosperity and for the sake of the nation, the Church must find some way to solve her problem of religious education.

Missions. Since the Lord has laid upon the Church the obligation to preach the Gospel to every creature (Mark 16:15) and to make disciples of all the nations (Matt. 28:19), it is the duty of the Church to carry on the work of missions. This work includes the evangelization of heathen lands, or foreign missions; the bringing of the Gospel to the unchurched persons in our own land, or home missions; and the ministering to the needy and destitute in order to bring the Gospel to them, or inner missions. This duty of missions is involved in the duty to love our fellow men as ourselves. Christ's work of redemption was not wrought out simply for the benefit of those who now and from time to time constitute the Church, but for all men. He is the propitiation, not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2). God desires to save all; and all men need the salvation which the Gospel offers. For the Church to be remiss in the work of missions in any of the three fields mentioned, and to rest content with her own possession of the Gospel, would be to exhibit a spirit of selfishness and a lack of love to God and man which are utterly unworthy of her high and holy calling. It is necessary for the Church not only vigorously to carry on this varied work, but constantly to urge its importance upon the members of the Church, so that they may cheerfully and adequately support the work by furnishing both the men and the money needed.

The Empirical Church, composed of believers and of those who only profess to believe, is the outward agency through which the Word of God and the sacraments are administered. Though the particular form or organization which the empirical Church is to take is not prescribed in the Holy Scriptures, the form adopted should be one that is regarded as best adapted for the doing of the work with which the Church is charged. Whether the form of government shall be episcopalian, presbyterian, synodical, or congregational is a matter of expediency, and is left to the judgment of the Church.

The basic form in which the empirical Church appears is the congregation. The unity of faith which exists among those congregations which hold the same confession draws them together into general bodies, such as synods, and these synods again into larger general bodies. This enables the Church to conduct the larger operations involved in the fulfillment of her task by the harmonious coöperation of the various local units. The constitutions of the local congregations as well as of the general bodies must guard the pure preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments, as well as lay down the necessary regulations for the practical work of the organization, and make provision for compliance with the laws of the state.

Discipline must be exercised in accordance with the method of procedure laid down by Christ (Matt. 18:15-17). In extreme cases the Church has power to suspend or excommunicate from membership. While discipline is necessary and should not be neglected, care must be exercised not to fall into the Donatistic error of seeking actually to exclude from membership all persons except those who are real Christians. It is not possible for the Church to distinguish accurately between the wheat and the tares (Matt. 13:29). Those who have become remiss in their duties as Church members should not be summarily stricken from the list, but counted among the inactive members who are to be reclaimed, if possible, from their indifference.

The Ministry. For the administration of the Word and sacraments the Church possesses the office of the ministry. This office is not identical with the priesthood of all believers, nor a transfer to a particular person of an office which belongs to every believer in the congregation. It is not a special order or priesthood in the Church, and it does not confer a *character indelibilis.* It is a special office necessary and instituted for the proper administration of the Means of Grace and for the oversight of the Church. It is not identical with the apostleship, but is a separate and distinct office; for the apostles were eye-witnesses of the resurrection, were divinely inspired, and possessed the power of working miracles.

These ministers must be regularly called by the Church, either through the local congregation or the synods and their boards. The importance and the responsibilities of the ministerial office render it necessary that the candidates for it shall be carefully examined as to their intellectual and spiritual fitness for the work. They should possess a liberal culture and a special theological training. The New Testament recognizes no distinction between the office of a presbyter and that of a bishop; it is the same office under a different name (Tit. 1:5-7). As a matter of expediency the Church may have the episcopacy; but bishops are not the successors of the apostles, and they are not essential to the Church.

Deacons and Deaconesses. For the purpose of administering the external and temporal affairs of the Church and of assisting the ministers in their work, the Church possesses the office of the diaconate (Acts 6:1-6). In recent years the office of the deaconess, which existed in the apostolic Church, has been revived for the better performance of the Church's work of mercy. This office is not to be regarded as an order like that of the Roman Catholic nuns. While deaconesses remain single, they are always at liberty to demit the office and be married, if they desire to do so.

Church and State. The relation of Church and State is to be determined on the basis of Christ's command to render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's (Matt. 22:21). The sphere of the Church and that of the State are different. Neither must interfere with the affairs of the other. Since the Church possesses an external organization, it is in temporal matters subject to the laws of the State; but in spiritual matters, in those which concern the sphere of the Church as such, the State has nothing to say. On the other hand the Church has no right to interfere in the affairs of the State. She has no right as an organization to take any part in politics. In all her activities she must aim at spiritual results and use spiritual means. Her one fundamental duty is that of administering the Means of Grace. She has no call officially as a Church, therefore, to enter into any purely humanitarian enterprises, to organize plans for social uplift, to take sides in industrial disputes, to line up with a particular political party, or to push political measures of any kind through legislatures or congress. Her members as individual Christian citizens may and often should do many of these things. They have political rights and duties which they are to assert and fulfill in a Christian and conscientious manner. But the Church as a Church should confine herself to that work which belongs to her; namely, the work of preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ and of enunciating the principles of love and righteousness which should guide men in their social and political relations. The application of those principles is to be made by her members in their capacity as individual Christian citizens. The Protestant Churches which take a hand in politics and align themselves with a political issue, movement or party deprive themselves of the right of protest against similar activity on the part of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Individual. The duties of the individual members of the Church include those which are common to all of them and those which are peculiar to the pastor. The duties of the latter are many and various, and can only be briefly touched upon here. Their full consideration belongs under the head of Practical Theology, rather than under that of Christian Ethics.

The Pastor is to be the spiritual leader, and to give an example to the flock. He is to keep watch over the souls entrusted to him (Acts 20:28), over the teaching, and over himself (1 Tim. 4:16). His office is that of a minister of the Word; and he must preach the Word in season and out of season (2 Tim. 4:2). His constant theme is to be Jesus Christ and Him crucified. He is to proclaim the Word from the pulpit, in the catechetical class, and in his pastoral activities. The erring, the troubled and anxious, the sorrowing, the sick and the dying are to be special objects of his solicitude. The manifold duties of his office make it necessary for him to systematize his work and apportion his time, so that he may give the needful attention to prayer and study. He will need to guard his flock against many errors prevalent in the world, but he must be careful not to introduce the discussion and refutation of errors of which his people have not heard, lest he fail, perhaps, to remove the very doubts which he himself has raised. His preaching of the Word from the pulpit and in his social contact with men should be his personal testimony to the truth, as something which he himself believes from the heart and has experienced in his life. Such genuineness on his part will go farther in persuading men to accept the Gospel than much labored demonstration which lacks the ring of downright earnestness. The degree of the education and culture possessed by the people of his parish will modify the form but not the essence of the true preacher's message. All men have need of the very same Gospel.

The Layman. The duties of the lay members of the Church include attendance at the public services, loyalty to Christ and the Church, Christian conduct, and the consecration of their time, strength, talents and possessions to the furtherance of the Kingdom of God.

Attendance at Services. The Christian should attend the public services regularly. He is not to neglect the Christian assembly (Heb. 10:25), but to appear in it gladly. It is a duty which he owes to God, to himself and to his fellow men. He owes it to God publicly to worship and praise Him, to thank Him for His goodness, and to join in the common supplications for His mercy and grace. He owes it to himself to be encouraged and inspired by the common worship, and to receive the instruction, guidance, warning and comfort dispensed in the Word (2 Tim. 3:15) and the sacrament (1 Cor. 11:25 seq.). He owes it to his fellow men to bear witness by his attendance that he is a believer; and to his fellow Christians, to cheer and encourage them by his presence. He should join heartily in the service, and receive the Word with meekness (Jas. 1:21) in an honest and good heart (Luke 8:15).

Loyalty to Christ, to his own particular Church or denomination, and to the congregation of which he is a member is essential on the part of the Christian, in order that he may contribute his share toward the accomplishment of the Church's task. Loyalty to Christ will insure his personal salvation, and at the same time help to guard his own Church and congregation against departure from the true doctrine of the Gospel, the acceptance of false ideals, and the adoption of wrong practices. Loyalty to his own denomination and congregation will enable him to do his part in the local work of the Church and in the activities of missions, education and the like. In accordance with the nature of things, the Christian can do his share of the Church's work only by operating through the channels which the Church has established for the purpose.

While it is true that the Church of Christ includes the true believers in all the different Churches and denominations, and the Christian lives in spiritual fellowship with them all in Christ their common Savior, this does not involve any assumption that there is no important difference between the various Churches, and that the Christian may look with equal favor upon all. If he is a member of a particular Church by conviction, as he ought to be, because he believes that that particular Church teaches the Gospel in its purity, loyalty demands that he stand by and remain faithful to his own Church. While he gladly acknowledges the good which there is in other Churches, and hopes and prays for a closer approach in doctrine and spirit and for an ultimate union, he cannot be blind to the errors which such Churches teach, nor consent to any external union which would imply that their divergence from Scriptural teaching is a matter of no importance. While granting to other men the right to hold fast to their honest convictions, he must resolutely maintain the same right for himself, and earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints (Jude 3). Such an attitude is not bigotry, but loyalty to Christ and the truth. Unionistic efforts based upon an ignoring of the teachings of Scripture can lead only to union without unity, and will probably produce worse divisions in the end. True union can take place only where there is unity of faith. All the more, however, should those portions of the Church which hold the same beliefs and accept the same confessions strive for a union with each other. A divided Church means loss in members, prestige and influence.

Christian Conduct. It is the duty of the Church member to lead a Christian life. This is necessary not only on his own account, that he may hold fast by faith the salvation which is his in Christ Jesus, but necessary also from the standpoint of the Church. The work of the Church is often hampered and seriously harmed by the unchristian conduct of many of its members. On the other hand the work of the Church is greatly helped by a consistent Christian life on the part of its members. We are to let our light shine before men that they may see our good works and glorify our Father who is in heaven (Matt. 5:16). The members in their relation to one another and the world round about them should be actuated by Christian love, and should manifest by their conduct the presence and power of the various Christian virtues which spring from love. They should live and labor together in love and harmony, so that they may be effective instruments in Christ's hand for the evangelization of the world. There were divisions and quarrels in the apostolic churches, and there will probably be divisions and quarrels in some congregations to the end of time. This, however, is deplorable. As the believers are one in Christ, with one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all; so they should walk worthy of the vocation with which they are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love, and endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Eph. 4:1-3).

Stewardship. The obligation of Christian stewardship rests upon each individual member of the Church. The believer no longer belongs to himself; for he has been bought with a price (1 Cor. 6:20), and he has surrendered himself to Christ. Hence, all that he is and all that he possesses belongs to Christ. His talents, time, strength and earthly possessions are entrusted to him for faithful administration in Christ's cause. If the members of the Church have no inclination or claim to have no time to do the work which devolves upon the laity of the Church, and lack ardor, zeal and liberality in the promotion of the Church's task of evangelizing the world, how shall the Church prosper? It is, therefore, the duty of the individual Christian to be ready for every good work which devolves upon him in the local congregation or the Church at large, and to give of his substance liberally and cheerfully. The diversity of gifts and talents in the Church fits the various individuals for a variety of Christian service. Every Christian is important in his place, just as are the members of the human body (1 Cor. 12:12 seq.). The proper functioning of each is necessary for the well-being of the whole.

The individual members of the Church should realize the duty of proper giving to the Lord's cause. Right giving is as necessary on the part of the Christian as right living. If his living is to give evidence and proof of his faith, so also is his giving. The duty of preaching the Gospel in all the world is laid upon all the members of the Church. Those who cannot go out as actual preachers of the Gospel should all the more be concerned to give liberally, so that others may be sent out to preach. Unless the giving is in proportion to the need, the Church's work will languish for lack of funds.

This raises the question as to what constitutes proper giving on the part of the Christian. He should give cheerfully (2 Cor. 9:7) as God has prospered him (1 Cor. 16:2). But in what proportion shall he give? It is argued by many that every Christian should give one-tenth of his income to the Lord, because this was the requirement made of the Israelites in Old Testament times. But the ceremonial law has been abolished, and the tithe cannot be made a legal requirement of Christians. It may, however, be argued from the evangelical standpoint that the divinely enjoined Old Testament practice of tithing might well have its New Testament counterpart, freed from the legalistic element and imbued with the New Testament spirit, just as the Old Testament Sabbath has its evangelical counterpart in the New Testament Sunday. Every Christian should seek to visualize the magnitude of the Church's task of evangelizing the world and the need of vast sums of money for its accomplishment, and should weigh well the question whether it is not his duty to be a tither. If the Israelites gave one-tenth of their income to the Lord because it was required of them by law, should not the Christian give at least one-tenth of his income to the Lord out of gratitude and love to Him? The constant handicap under which the various boards of the Church labor, because they lack the necessary funds for the proper and effective doing of the Church's work, would be removed, if Christian tithing became general.

Sunday. The observance of Sunday must be regarded from a twofold standpoint; first, from that of the Christian ethical life as conditioned by the use of the Means of Grace; and secondly, from that of the natural life and the need of a day of rest as founded in God's will manifested at creation.

From the Christian ethical standpoint it is to be observed that the Third Commandment, in so far as it enjoined a particular day as a day of rest, was a part of the ceremonial law of the Jews and has been abrogated together with the rest of that law. The Gentile Christians of the apostles' day did not observe the Sabbath (Col. 2:16, 17; Acts 15). Christians have not been commanded by God to observe any particular day; and the New Testament declares that for them one day is in itself no holier than another, that all days are alike, and that all days are holy days (Rom. 14:5, 6; Gal. 4:10, 11; Col. 2:16, 17; Acts 2:46).

Not the Sabbath. The Christian Sunday is not a New Testament substitute for the Old Testament Sabbath, but is an entirely different institution. The early Jewish Christians observed both the Sabbath and Sunday side by side. Since they are distinct institutions, neither the command to rest nor any other Old Testament regulation concerning the observance of the Sabbath is binding upon the Christian with respect to the observance of Sunday. The Lord's Day was voluntarily set apart by the Church in the exercise of her Christian liberty. She chose the first day of the week, because it was the day of the Lord's resurrection. The observance of this day had the sanction of the apostles, who were divinely inspired, and is therefore in accordance with the will of God (Rev. 1:10). The question of rest had nothing to do with the original institution of the Lord's Day. The purpose of the Church in instituting the observance of Sunday was not to establish a day of rest from labor, but to appoint a day for the common commemoration of the Lord's resurrection and for the common worship of the believers.

Proper Observance. The Christian ethical significance of the Lord's Day and the manner of its proper observance must be deduced from the purpose of its institution by the Church. Its purpose is to make possible a common hearing of the Word, or, more broadly speaking, a common Christian worship. Hence the proper manner of observing the Lord's Day is amply and beautifully brought out by Luther in his explanation of the Third Commandment in his Small Catechism; "We should fear and love God so as not to despise His Word and the preaching of the Gospel, but deem it holy and willingly hear and learn it." What may or may not be done by the Christian on Sunday must be decided from its effect upon his proper hearing and heeding of the Word. To insist upon a complete resting from all work or recreation as a direct command of God with respect to the Lord's Day is legalistic, Sabbatarian and unscriptural. To begin the explanation of the Third Commandment with an elaborate distinction between what may and what may not be done on Sunday fosters a legalistic and not an evangelical view of the Lord's Day. The emphasis must be upon the real purpose of the day, which is the hearing of the Word. What may or may not be done on Sunday must be decided from the standpoint of that purpose. Any unnecessary work or recreation which hinders us from hearing God's Word and profiting by it on the Lord's Day is sinful. Whatever will not interfere with the real purpose of the day, we may do. Whatever will interfere with the real purpose of the day is a thing which we may not do. The decision as to what may or may not be done must be left to the judgment of the individual Christian's conscience. But when he decides, he must take into account not only the question whether it interferes with his own spiritual profiting by the day, but also whether it will have a bad effect upon some other person who will point to him as an example and with him as an excuse will do what actually will interfere with the purpose of the day. Like Paul he must say, "All things are lawful for me, but not all things are expedient."

For the Christian the observance of the Lord's Day is a gracious privilege. It is a day of respite for body and mind in the midst of a week's labor and turmoil, and a day of refreshing and strengthening for the soul by devout attendance upon the Means of Grace. For him the duty to observe the Lord's Day is essentially the duty to profit by a blessed privilege; and the sin in failing to observe it is essentially the sin of failing to profit by a privilege so graciously offered.

The presence of the Third Commandment in the decalogue and its application to Sunday by the Catechism are to be explained by the fact that it contains an underlying moral element as well as a ceremonial regulation. The ceremonial element has been abrogated; the moral element abides. The moral element consists in the duty to cultivate communion with God. In its Old Testament significance the Third Commandment was equivalent to the command, "Remember thy Creator." In its New Testament significance it is equivalent to the command, "Remember thy Redeemer." The Lord's Day holds the same central position in the New Testament kingdom of God as the Sabbath held in the Old Testament kingdom of God. Both stand for the communion of the believer with God, and both are the center of an elaborate system of interrelated festivals.

As the Christian's holy day is a different day of the week from that of the Jews, so his observance of the day is different also. The Sabbath was observed by resting in accordance with a legal requirement: the Lord's Day is observed by voluntarily using the Means of Grace for the cultivation of our communion with God. Sometimes the attendance of the Christian upon the Means of Grace as well as the needed rest for his body and mind must be sacrificed in order that he may perform works of mercy in fulfillment of his duty to his fellow men.

Sunday Laws. From the standpoint of the natural life the observance of one day in seven as a day of rest is an order of God's creation which cannot be disregarded without harm to body and mind. Man needs one day's rest out of seven;

and he needs it all the more in view of the strenuous industrial life of the present age. For this reason Christians should labor for the enactment and observance of laws for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest. The endeavor to revive or pass so-called Blue Sunday Laws springs from a Sabbatarian view of Sunday, and is a mistaken effort to produce a religious observance of Sunday by law. Sunday laws must be regarded from the political and not from the religious standpoint. It is no part of the function of the State to compel religious observance of any kind. But it should pass laws which will give men the needed day of rest, and which will give an opportunity, for those who desire to do so, to observe Sunday as a day of worship. Much wisdom will be needed in the matter of law-making to steer safely between the Scylla of Sabbatarianism on the one hand, and the Charybdis of a wide open Sunday on the other. The State needs religious citizens; and while it is beyond the province of the State to teach religion, it has the right and duty so to shape its laws and regulations as to make the conditions as favorable as possible for the religious work of the Church.

CHAPTER XIX

THE STATE

Its Necessity. The State as it exists to-day is the result of historical development. Government of some kind has always been necessary and has always existed for the regulation of men's relations to one another as individuals and as members of lesser social groups. The nature of this government has varied from the simplicity of the rule of patriarchs and tribal chiefs to the elaborate machinery of vast empires, and from the reign of absolute despots to the mild rule of constitutional governments. The alternative of government is anarchy, or the unrestricted exercise of individual liberty. Anarchy stands for emancipation from all law, and makes the orderliness of society completely dependent on the manners and morals of the individual. If every human being were a regenerated and completely sanctified person, external law would be unnecessary. But such a condition of ethical perfection will never occur in this world, and government will always be needed for the regulation of the social relations of men. The expectation of some that men will grow into perfection by a naturalistic evolution, and of others that at some future date the whole race will have been brought into the Kingdom of God and completely conformed in mind and conduct to the will of God, is without foundation.

The Purpose of the State is to regulate and control the social relations of men with a view to securing and maintaining both liberty and justice. It should guard the liberty of the individual and of groups of individuals, and yet at the same time so restrict the exercise of that liberty that there is no infringement upon the rights of others. The ideal State would be one which accomplished its purpose with a minimum of restriction and a maximum of personal liberty.

The State is meant to guard the natural rights of the individual against aggression by other persons. These rights are possessed by the individual by reason of the fact that he is a human being, a person. The State does not confer them, but guards them. They are the right to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness, to obtain and hold property honestly, to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and to fulfill the duties and exercise the prerogatives belonging to our various stations and relationships in life. It is the duty of the State to guard these rights for all its citizens by exercising and maintaining justice; that is, by so adjusting the mutual relations of its citizens, that the liberty of the individual is not abused at the expense of his fellow men, and that conflicting claims may be equitably adjudicated. The State should exercise its functions with absolute impartiality, without respect to the wealth or poverty, the prominence or obscurity of the individuals concerned.

The purpose of the State is not primarily economic, just as it is not primarily scientific, artistic or religious. But since it is the business of the State to regulate the temporal affairs of its citizens in such a way as to promote the highest well-being of all its people, economic questions come in for a large share of the State's attention and legislation. In the minds of some persons the function of the State should be that of a great economic machine. This is essentially the socialistic and communistic idea. The socialists would turn over to the State all the natural resources and all the means of production and transportation, and thus make of the State a vast commercial enterprise, in which all the citizens would become employees of the State. The communists would go farther and abolish all private ownership of any kind, make the State the sole owner of everything, and have the State distribute to each man a more or less equal share of the profits of production. Those who are not enamored of such theories see in a communistic or even a socialistic State the virtual enslavement of the individual to the State, the loss of all real freedom, the strangling of all individual initiative, and the end of all real progress. At the same time, however, the abuse of privileges on the part of individuals, the concentration of immense wealth in the hands of a few, and the growing conviction that the existence of extreme wealth and of extreme poverty side by side is entirely wrong has compelled the State and probably will continue to compel it to legislate from time to time in economic matters, so as to supervise and regulate the private control of vast enterprises which intimately concern the interests and well-being of the public.

Range of Its Activities. The modern State in caring for its people embraces within the realm of its activity public education, insistence upon reasonable parental care, the protection of the life and health of workmen, proper safeguards in industries and transportation, the prevention of disease, quarantine regulations, the care of the disabled and of the mentally defective and insane, and many other matters. It seeks in general to steer a safe course between extreme individualism on the one hand and paternalism on the other.

The tendency of many persons to-day is to rely unduly upon a centralized power for the solution of every conceivable moral or economic problem. Carried to excess, such a tendency leads to bureaucracy, the abuse of governmental powers, the stifling of individual enterprise, and a false reliance upon the government to achieve every desirable end by legislation.

Justice and Order. Clothed, as it is, with supreme political authority it is the duty of the State to maintain justice and order, to enforce obedience to the law, and to punish transgressors. It deals with overt acts, and not with thoughts and feelings; and any attempt to control the latter by law can only result in oppression and tyranny. It deals with the conduct of the individual, but only in so far as the actions of the individual affect the rights or liberty of other persons. It does not seek to make the individual a moral man by force. Any attempt to do so would not only be an unjustifiable interference with personal liberty, but would be a futile proceeding, since no external law can change a man's heart. Divine grace alone can do that through the Gospel. It is to be feared, however, that there are still many persons who imagine that their fellow men can be made good by law; whereas the most that the law can accomplish is to bring about through fear of punishment an outward compliance with the law's demand. When the fear of the penalty is removed or sufficiently reduced, the immoral man acts as immorally as before. But while the State cannot make men moral, it can and should provide as far as possible conditions which are favorable to morality, and can and should hold in check and punish the lawless and criminal forces which endanger the social order.

The Laws of the State are supposed to represent the consensus of public opinion as to what is right and just. To a large extent they are an index of the people's ethical ideals of social conduct. At best laws can produce only outward conformity; but this outward conformity has a large moral value in that it sets up a certain legal standard of social morality. The Christian standard is vastly higher, of course, because it involves the morality of the heart and the will. The State properly insists on obedience to its law; otherwise it would not be fulfilling its function; and lawlessness, confusion, and anarchy would result. But for the proper enforcement of law the moral support of a large majority of the citizens is necessary. Where this moral support is wanting enforcement becomes difficult and even impossible; and in the end the law must be repealed or become a dead letter. Penalties so severe that they are out of all proportion to the crime committed are not only an injustice, but they make it difficult to obtain convictions from juries.

Laws are aimed at what is conceived to be a good or moral purpose; but a law is not necessarily a good or right law because it is well-intentioned. It must embody in itself a right and effective way of achieving the right end. As a law it is a political measure aimed at a moral end, and not a moral thing in itself. Hence, good men who agree about the desirableness of a certain moral end may radically differ as to the wisdom of a particular law which is intended to achieve that end. Sumptuary laws which undertake to regulate the private life of the individual are politically justifiable only in so far as they are aimed at the prevention of injury to others. Ethically they are futile, because they work by coercion and not by moral suasion.

Punishment. The laws of the State are accompanied by penalties for their transgression. Punishment is inseparable from law, and without it law would be useless. In times past many of the punishments inflicted even for minor offenses were cruel and barbarous. The influence of Christianity has gradually mitigated the unjustifiable severity of the past. But Christianity itself recognizes and emphasizes the necessity of punishment as the reaction of justice against crime. Punishment is not merely reformatory, but retributive.

The theory that crime is simply due to physical or mental disease, and therefore the criminal is not to be punished but made the object of pathological study, or that he is the victim of society, and therefore not to be punished, but to be treated simply as an object of pity, is not tenable in the light of the facts in the case. Undoubtedly there are some thieves and murderers who, instead of being punished, should be confined in an asylum for idiots or lunatics; but in the case of the vast majority of criminals the trouble lies not in insanity but in moral obliquity. Any other view would rob man of personality, and reduce him morally to the level of the brute. The obligation of the State is to punish the criminal; and failure to do so would lead inevitably to an increase of crime. It is the hope of escape from the penalty that encourages many persons to commit crimes. The task of the State is to seek to prevent crime by making the punishment certain and adequate. The death penalty for murder is supported in Scripture by a reason which is still valid (Gen. 9:6).

Reclaiming the Criminal. At the same time, however, that punishment is retributive, the State should be concerned for the reformation of the criminal and for turning him into a good law-abiding citizen. Hence the necessity of distinguishing between first offenders and hardened criminals, both as regards the severity of the punishment and the place of confinement. Much more should, doubtless, be done than is now being done to promote a new attitude of the criminal toward society. Prisoners should be given opportunity to learn some useful occupation, so that when they are discharged they may not drift back to their old companions and criminal habits. The criminal should be made to pay the penalty for his crime; but at the same time he should be regarded as an object of Christian love, and should, if possible, be reclaimed from his criminal ways. This involves the application of the principles both of justice and of mercy, and the placing of prisons in the hands of wardens who are chosen because of their peculiar fitness for the work and not for purely political reasons. The Church should always be ready to coöperate with the State in the work of reclaiming the criminal. It is at present doing much good in connection with the probation of juvenile offenders against the law.

Sovereignty. The State is a sovereign power. As there are numerous sovereign powers in the world, international relationships of some kind are inevitable. How shall conflicting claims of sovereign powers be adjudicated? The recourse in the past has generally been to arms. The nation which, with its allies, proved itself the more powerful imposed its will upon its foe, and acted on the principle that to the victor belongs the spoil. But the victor in a war is no more proved to be right than the victor in a duel. Might does not make right. Such a method of settling international disputes is barbarous and unchristian, and in these days of destructive inventions threatens to become suicidal for the race. It is as repulsive to common sense as to Christianity.

International Relations. The same principles of Christianity which should rule in the relations of individuals to one another should rule also in the relations of the various States. In the last analysis the State is the aggregate of the individuals composing it. A nation composed of individuals can no more justly absolve itself from the obligations of Christian morality, than can the individuals in it. Nor can the responsibility for wrong conduct in international affairs be entirely shifted from the shoulders of the citizens to an impersonal State. It is true that the individual citizen cannot prevent war if the officials of the State determine to declare it. But it is also true that the State acts for the citizens in their combined capacity as a nation, and that in all probability it would not declare war if public opinion absolutely condemned war as a method of settling international disputes.

A State is as much in duty bound to act toward other States in a spirit of Christian love, kindness and justice, and as little entitled to insist on its claims simply by reason of its power as is an individual person.

War. That a nation has the right to defend itself when self-defense becomes necessary is self-evident; just as the right of the individual to defend himself under certain circumstances is self-evident. The trouble lies in the fact that nations, when they go to war, always maintain that they are doing so in self-defense. No nation will to-day acknowledge that it purposes a war of aggression. The cure for war must be found not in an impossible distinction between wars of defense and wars of aggression, but in a recognition of the fact that wars are, from the human and Christian standpoint, an utterly unjustifiable method of settling international disputes, and that other, saner, civilized and Christian methods of settling them must be found. This will require not only the establishment of some sort of international tribunal for the adjudication of the conflicting claims of sovereign States, but an overcoming of the attitudes which tend to produce war; such as distrust and suspicion, misunderstandings, misrepresentations, greed, pride, national arrogance, false patriotism, war propaganda and the like, and a complete change in the conception of the relation which States should bear toward each other. There is a society of nations as well as a society of individuals; and the spirit of justice, amity and benevolence should rule in one as in the other.

Up to this time the States have practiced among themselves a mode of settling their disputes which they would not for a moment tolerate among the individuals of their realm. A new emphasis upon justice instead of upon power, upon right instead of upon might, upon love instead of upon selfishness, and upon the inestimable value of peace as compared with any possible gain to be gotten from war, is necessary. For war produces indescribable horrors and misery, involves tremendous losses in property, lives and moral ideals, and brings no real gain even to the victor. It is senseless as well as sinful.

The Christian State. That the spheres of Church and State are distinct is pointed out by Christ in His command to render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's and unto God the things which are God's (Matt. 22:21). This principle is recognized in America by the separation of Church and State. It is a principle condemned by the Roman Catholic Church, but acknowledged as right and Biblical by the Protestant Churches. Neither the State nor the Church has the right to interfere in the affairs of the other. The State is concerned with the temporal welfare of men and the maintenance of outward law and order; while the Church is concerned with the spiritual welfare of men and the maintenance of genuine religion and morality in the heart.

In spite of this proper separation of Church and State, however, we may nevertheless speak of a State as being a Christian State, if the major portion of its citizens professes to be Christians, and its legislation and administration are controlled by Christian ideals. In this sense the United States of America is a Christian State, and should become more and more so by the increasing Christian character of its people. While the name of God does not appear in its constitution, the American State recognizes Christian morals as the basis of its laws, dates time in the year of our Lord, sets Sunday apart as a legal holiday, takes oaths upon the Bible, prohibits blasphemy, and appoints special days of prayer and thanksgiving. There is, however, no discrimination against non-Christians. Liberty of conscience is granted to every man, and Christians and non-Christians are guaranteed equal legal rights.

Religion must not be taught in the public schools. But while Christians recognize this fact, they have the right to insist that, if the Christian religion shall not be taught, neither shall irreligion; and hence that the teaching of atheism, infidelity, agnosticism and materialism shall find no place in our schools. The evils of a godless education are becoming painfully apparent in the prevalence of crime and the lack of a sensitive public conscience with regard to many great evils. The proposal that instruction in moral philosophy be given in the public schools as a means of stemming the rising tide of lawlessness and crime is unsatisfactory, because without religion and God morality lacks a sufficient motive. While the State cannot teach religion, matters are rapidly reaching a point where in self-defense the State will be obliged actively to encourage the teaching of religion to the young by the Church. A godless nation is headed for destruction.

The Christian as a Citizen. The Christian recognizes with St. Paul (Rom. 13:1 seq.) that government is divine, and that obedience to the State is a Christian obligation. The State is God's servant for the punishment of evil doers and the protection of those that do well. It is not simply a human arrangement or a social contract, but it is an ordinance of God for the maintenance of law and order and the furtherance of human welfare. Disobedience to the government is disobedience to God whose agent the government is. So long as the laws of the State are not in conflict with the law of God it is the duty of the Christian to render implicit obedience to them. Even if they happen to be laws of which he personally disapproves, it is nevertheless his duty to obey them so long as they remain on the statute books. Any other course is lawlessness and incipient anarchy. He is at liberty, however, to work for the repeal of any law which he deems unwise or harmful, and indeed may be in duty bound to do so.

The duty of obedience to the State is enjoined in Scripture (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:1-5; 1 Pet. 2:13). Insurrection and rebellion are forbidden (Rom. 13:2). Changes in the forms and methods of government are to be obtained by legal means. Resistance is justifiable only when those in authority persist in violating the basic principles of the State, and when resistance therefore is really a defense of the State against those who are seeking to revolutionize it from above. Refusal of obedience is justifiable and necessary when the commands of the State conflict with the commands of God

(Acts, 5:29), in which case the Christian must be ready to endure the penalty for disobedience.

It is the duty of the citizen to pay his taxes without any attempt at evasion. He should willingly pay his share of the costs of government. At the same time he has, as a citizen, a right to expect that the funds of the government shall be properly and economically expended. He should be patriotic and have true love for his country. But true patriotism has in mind not only enemies abroad but those persons and influences at home which threaten the State with real perils. Patriotism is a virtue to be exercised not only in time of war but also in time of peace. It is concerned for the internal welfare of the nation as well as for its external standing among the nations. Its desire is for a nation fearing God and working righteousness, and a State eminent for justice and fair-dealing with all other States, rather than a State preëminent through martial victories. It rallies to the defense of the State when attacked; but has no sympathy with national arrogance, jingoism and mailed-fist diplomacy. Believing that the true interest of the State and its people is found in the peaceful pursuit of their vocations, it regards war as an unmitigated evil to be avoided by every possible concession for the sake of peace. The Christian patriot will pray for his country, for all who are in authority over him, and for the true well-being of all his fellow citizens. He sees the highest good of his country in the growth of right Christian character in its citizens, and in the regulation of the activities of the individuals and of the State itself by the principles of Christianity.

Offices. The officials of the government are the servants of the State, and hence of the people, and should discharge their various duties with conscientiousness and fidelity. "Public office is a public trust," to be administered for the benefit of the people and not of the office-holder. While the Church, as such, should never meddle in the affairs of the State nor enter into politics, her members as citizens of the State should make the influence of their Christian character and ideals felt, whether as plain citizens in their vote, or as public officials in the conscientious discharge of their official duties. A Christian will not permit himself to be bribed by money or favors of any kind, but will discharge the duties of his office with justice, honesty and impartiality. The ballot is not only a great privilege but a great responsibility, and should be used to vote for men and policies which will further truth and righteousness and the true welfare of all the people. The failure to vote is a neglect of a duty.

Proper honor and respect should be paid to those who hold positions of authority and trust (Acts 23:1-4). Disrespect for those in authority has a tendency to breed disrespect for the authority which they represent. The Christian is to render to all their due: tribute to whom tribute, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor (Rom. 13:7). Errors and abuses in the government may and should be pointed out and corrected; for power is capable of abuse in republics as well as in monarchies. And eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and justice.

CHAPTER XX

SOCIETY IN GENERAL

Duties to All Mankind. The Christian is not only a member of the family, the Church and the State, but also a member of the human race as a whole. He has duties, therefore, not only with respect to the three institutions mentioned, but with respect to mankind in general. Since the human race is descended from the same first parents, it constitutes one great family; and Christian duty includes in its scope every member of the race.

Social Duties. The ancients recognized no duties beyond the bounds of their own nationality. The later Stoics, it is true, developed a form of cosmopolitanism and a certain consciousness of a common humanity which bound men together; but their theory had little practical influence upon their conduct. The Israelites, in spite of prophecies foretelling a wondrous future which included the Gentiles also, and in spite of precepts which enjoined kindness to the stranger and even to the enemy (Prov. 14:31; 25:21), nevertheless quite generally regarded their social duties as limited to their fellow countrymen. But Christianity includes all men within the scope of duty. It forbids the exploitation of backward races for the benefit of the more civilized races, and demands that in every case conduct should be regulated by the law of love. It enjoins a genuine humanitarianism which manifests itself in an interest in all that promotes human welfare in any part of the world, and in an endeavor to overcome the spiritual evils of the race through the Gospel, and the social and economic evils by personal efforts and proper legislation. In its organized form this Christian activity appears in institutions of mercy, in inner missions, in home missions and in foreign missions by the Church; in institutions for the care of the poor, the disabled, the blind, the deaf, the physically and mentally diseased and the like by the State; and in organized efforts of individuals for the relief of the distress caused by famines, floods, earthquakes and other calamities in all parts of the world.

In the nature of the case most of the duties of the Christian toward his fellow men concern his conduct in the society in which he lives and toward those persons with whom he comes into some kind of personal contact and with whom he stands in some sort of social relationship. We shall, therefore, treat in this chapter of the duties of the Christian as a member of society in general.

Work. As a member of human society each person has his work to do, not simply as a means of making a livelihood, but as a social duty (Gen. 1:28). The work of each person in his place is necessary for the well-being of all. The earth contains the natural resources necessary for the supply of the economic needs of the race for many years to come, whatever may be the prophecies concerning a scarcity at some future date when the population of the earth has greatly increased. But the development of the resources which nature furnishes requires on the part of men labor of body and mind. Industry is required not only for the welfare of the individual but for that of humanity as a whole.

Idleness is a curse, in that it is not only a waste of time and energy that could be put to useful service, but exposes the idler to extraordinary temptations to evil. This is true of the man of independent means as well as of the man who is compelled to toil for his daily bread. Those who are freed from the necessity of working for a livelihood should regard that fact as imposing an obligation to assume a share of the larger burdens of humanity. The Scriptures enjoin industry by pointing to the ant (Prov. 6:6-11), and declare that those who will not work should not eat (2 Thess. 3:10). Idleness is a fruitful source of vice and crime, while diligence in the performance of the daily round of honest work promotes the happiness and well-being of the individual and of the race.

The Christian should be faithful and conscientious in the discharge of the duties which devolve upon him in his daily occupation, whether he be an employer or an employee. It is a matter of common honesty that the employee shall render a real day's work for a day's pay, and that the employer shall give a real day's pay for a day's work, and shall furnish proper value in goods for the price at which he sells to the public. But more than mere honesty is required. Our work is to be done in the spirit of love to God and man, and hence for God's glory (1 Cor. 10:31) and with an eye for the neighbor's welfare. Unfaithfulness in the discharge of daily duties often has dire consequences in the lives of others. Most accidents, if traced to their source, would be found to be due to the failure of some person to do his daily duty conscientiously.

The ancients found the occupation of the free man solely in political activity, because they regarded man from the standpoint of citizenship in the State. But Christianity has given dignity to all work, however humble, if done in Christ's name and for His sake (John 13:12-17). The test of the workman is not the dignity of the work in human estimation, but the faithfulness of its performance.

Choice of Occupation. The nature of the work to be done results in a great variety of occupations, which in America are barred to none by class cleavage. In many countries the barrier of caste confines men to a narrow choice of occupation, and results in the inability of many men to engage in more important work for which their natural talents fit them. While there are various social strata and many different classes of workers in America, such as the agricultural class, the mechanics, the industrial workers, the laborers, the clerks, the merchants, the philosophers, the artists, the musicians, the poets, the novelists, the scientists, and the professional men, there is no legal or social impediment in the way of any man's entering the occupation which he chooses. Each person should, however, seek to choose an occupation for which his talents fit him, and in which he can work with mental satisfaction.

The Christian should not regard his occupation as a mere means of making money, nor should he choose a certain occupation simply because it offers the largest opportunity to amass wealth. Here, as in all of his activity, the fundamental and determining motive should be love to God and its corollary, love to man. Where opportunity for choice is open, he should choose that work which offers the possibility of doing the greatest amount of good in promoting the cause of God and the welfare of humanity.

Property. That the earth belongs to man for his use, subject to the higher ownership of God (1 Cor. 10:26), is declared at the very beginning of the history of the race (Gen. 1:28). That this means the race as a whole, and not a few individuals, is clear. At the same time the right of the individual to possess and hold property is guaranteed by the commandment which forbids stealing. The question thus naturally arises as to how the world's wealth may become the property of individuals without infringing upon the rights of others. This question is a live issue to-day, and is not easy to answer.

The conditions under which property may be legally acquired are defined by the State, and include original claim, inheritance, gift and labor of body or mind. The unequal distribution of property, considered from the human side, is due either to the accident of birth and inheritance, or to the possession of a greater ability or the presence of a stronger desire for the acquisition and accumulation of wealth. Some men have no time to make money, but are busy on matters of greater importance. The world owes to such men an immense debt of gratitude. Others are too lazy and thriftless to make or accumulate much money. Energy, industry, foresight, thrift and economy are important factors in the acquisition of earthly possessions; but these seldom lead to wealth without a certain business sagacity which may or may not be found in conjunction with large general intelligence. From the standpoint of human welfare and of the duty of each man to serve humanity, it is folly to rate a man's success in life by the amount of money which he has accumulated. He may have become very rich, and yet from the standpoint of ethics his life may be a veritable failure.

Much property is, doubtless, acquired by questionable means; but, on the other hand, enormous fortunes have been acquired by means which have been not only legal but moral according to the accepted business standards of the day. The question which occupies men's minds in this connection is whether there is not something wrong somewhere with a system under which one man manages to accumulate many millions of dollars, while countless other persons accumulate nothing, and under which the wealth of the world is in the hands of an exceedingly small minority of the people.

The examples of Abraham and Job show how godliness and great wealth may exist together; and again, the example of Dives shows how selfishness and great wealth may exist together. It is of fundamental importance to bear in mind that all possessions, great or small, are held in trust for the Lord, whose is the earth and the fullness thereof. The existence of poverty is to be a constant incentive to beneficence; but this beneficence should not be directed simply toward the temporary alleviation of destitution and distress, but toward the removal of poverty by a rectification of the conditions which produce it.

The partial community of goods in the early Church was voluntary and not compulsory, and did not long survive. An equal division of property, such as some persons have proposed, would soon result in a clamor for another division by those who had failed to retain or increase their portion. Nevertheless, the unequal distribution of money and property has brought the whole social and economic system into the foreground of thought and discussion.

Problems. Modern methods of business and industry have reduced labor to a commodity which the laborer seeks to dispose of at the highest possible price, while the employer seeks to obtain it at the lowest possible price. Thousands are reduced to a sort of industrial slavery, child labor, low wages, insufficient income and total lack of provision for old age. The increased use of machinery threatens to throw great numbers of persons into permanent unemployment. While much improvement has been brought about in many lines of labor with regard to the length of the working-day, and employer and employee have in many instances come to see that their interests are mutual and not conflicting, there is still need of a larger permeation of the business world with the spirit of Christianity, and a larger regulation of its affairs by the Golden Rule.

Labor organizations are an effort on the part of employees to meet the difficulties of the situation; but they include only the more intelligent and well-to-do workers, and not the common laborers, while millions of workers in stores and factories are unorganized. Capitalistic organizations on the one hand and labor organizations on the other frequently exist for the purpose of combating one another, instead of for the purpose of coöperating with one another for the solution of their common problems. So long as this is the case, and such organizations are chiefly intent upon gaining an advantage over one another, and the methods adopted are lockouts, strikes, boycotts, injunctions and even violence, no right solution of industrial problems can be expected. The application of the Christian principle that we should love our fellow men as ourselves, and that every man should look not only on his own things but also on those of others (Phil. 2:4), in other words, that each should try to see both sides of the questions at issue and consider the other man's interests as well as his own, offers the only way in which industrial problems can be justly and amicably solved.

Socialism is an effort to overcome the seeming or real defects of the present social and economic system by a social revolution, which is to be peaceful or otherwise according to the particular socialistic views which are held. A moderate form of socialism aims, not to abolish all private possessions, but to take over all the means of production as the property of society as a whole, on the principle that these justly belong to all the people. The World War has resulted in a great increase of socialistic propaganda, and in an experiment of a communistic socialism on a colossal scale in Russia.

The criticism of socialistic theories will vary with the particular kind of socialism under discussion. In general, the elements in socialism which from the ethical side are to be deprecated are its frequent antagonism to the Church and Christianity; its partial tendency toward the use of violent means for the realization of its program; and the underlying idea of all forms of socialism that the millenium can be brought about by a change in external social and economic conditions without a radical change in the sinful heart of man. The truth in socialism lies in some just criticisms of the evils in our social and economic fabric; and its error lies in its failure to recognize that the fundamental difficulty underlying the evils complained of is found in the unregenerated hearts and lives of men.

Riches and Poverty. While the acquisition of money in honest ways is necessary for subsistence, and the gaining of wealth by honorable means is not only unobjectionable, but enables its possessor to do much good by the right use of his money and property, the getting of gain should not be the principal aim of life (Matt. 6:33) nor the love of money the controlling affection of the heart (1 Tim. 6:10). If riches increase, the heart is not to be set upon them (Ps. 62:10). Riches make it difficult though not impossible to be saved (Matt. 19:24-26). Riches and poverty both have their peculiar temptations, and the most desirable state is that in which man is neither poor nor rich, but possesses sufficient for his needs (Prov. 30:8, 9). Not riches and not poverty, but Christian character counts before God, and should count before men. Rich and poor have a common Lord, and enter the kingdom of God on the same conditions.

The possession of wealth presents many temptations and involves a large responsibility. The Word of God is often choked by the deceitfulness of riches (Matt. 13:22); and pride, worldliness and self-gratification are frequently fostered by them. Trust in one's wealth may supplant humble trust in God. But wealth properly employed may be a blessing to the possessor and to many others if, as should be the case, it is regarded as a trust from God, and is used in accordance with His will.

The enormous increase in material wealth which recent years have brought to our American people presents many advantages from the economic standpoint; but it also threatens with many perils when viewed from the moral and religious standpoint. There is danger of too great an emphasis upon material prosperity and, hence, of a materialistic philosophy of life which ignores the finer values to be found in the cultivation of noble character and the achievement of moral and spiritual ends. A nation which finds little in itself to be proud of except its wealth will rate low in the cultural scale.

Right Use of Property. The fact that all who possess earthly means, whether great or small, are stewards of God requires that we shall employ our means in accordance with His will. The Christian should make proper provision for his own family (1 Tim. 5:8), and at the same time be ready to minister to the temporal and spiritual needs of others (Jas. 1:27; 1 John 3:17). The temporal aid which is given to others should be given judiciously, and may, in large measure though not exclusively, be bestowed through charitable organizations. Some cases demand personal attention and sympathy. What we do or neglect to do to our needy fellow men will be regarded by Christ on the day of judgment as having been done or not done to Him (Matt. 25:40, 45).

Since men have souls as well as bodies, and the needs of the soul are paramount, liberal support of the Church in its work of spiritual ministration is necessary. This support should include all the Church's work at home and abroad. While the New Testament makes no demand of a specific proportion of our income for the Lord's work, but simply exhorts the Christian to give in proportion to his ability (1 Cor. 16:2), many Christians feel that it is their duty to be tithers, not in the Old Testament legal sense, but in the New Testament evangelical sense, under the conviction that the Christian of his own free will ought to give at least as much to the Lord's cause as the Jew gave under legal compulsion. The motive that should constrain us is the love of Christ. Cheerful givers have a special promise of God's love of complacency (2 Cor. 9:7).

Honesty. The existence of property and of the distinction between "mine " and "thine" lays upon men the duty of honesty in their dealings with one another. This honesty should be genuine honesty in the heart, and not mere legal honesty which permits crooked dealings so long as they conform to the letter of human law. Like all the commandments of the second table of the law, the commandment not to steal must be interpreted in the light of the injunction to love our neighbor as ourselves. It therefore not only forbids every form of dishonesty, however subtle and refined, and enjoins absolute fairness in our dealings with others; but it also demands that we shall not take advantage of their necessity, and shall do what lies in our power to help them to protect and preserve their financial interests.

Christian ethical conduct involves vastly more than mere abstention from those practices which are universally regarded as forbidden: such as robbery, theft, burglary, embezzlement, forgery, extortion, concealing stolen property, refusing to restore lost property, evasion of taxes, bribery, gambling, adulteration of goods, substitution of inferior articles for those contracted for, and the like. It involves the shunning of all those dealings which in any way fall short of genuine fairness and equity, and, in addition to that, a genuinely benevolent attitude toward the other man's interests as well as toward one's own. The Christian should act toward the other man as he would have the other man act toward him, if the situations were reversed. The carrying out of this Christian principle may and probably will result in the loss of what worldly men regard as great opportunities for gain; but it will give to the Christian what is worth more than material gain, the testimony of a good conscience and the assurance of God's favor.

Dishonesty of every form has its root in greed. It is covetousness which prompts men to resort to questionable means of acquiring gain. Covetousness is theft in the heart. The Christian will, therefore, seek to subdue and overcome all tendency to avarice or to the laying of undue emphasis upon the importance of material gains. The wrongfulness and danger of a covetous heart are pointed out in the decalogue by a double command not to covet. The love of money, says the apostle, is a root of all evil, and covetousness has led many persons to spiritual disaster (1 Tim. 6:10). The curse of God lies upon dishonest gains (Hab. 2:6; Jer. 22:13). Repentance and restitution are demanded of those who have been guilty of dishonest practices (Luke 19:8), and a new course of honest labor combined with benevolence is required (Eph. 4:28).

Truthfulness is essential to the orderly conduct of human society. Without it confidence and honor could not exist; doubt, distrust, uncertainty and confusion would prevail; and the social relations would become intolerable. Since truth is of God and He cannot lie (Deut. 32:4; Num. 23:19; Heb. 6:18), while lying is of the devil (John 8:44), all forms of untruthfulness are incompatible with that true harmony with God which Christianity implies.

The essence of the lie is found in the intent to deceive or to harm. Hence, an unconscious falsehood is not a lie, though the one who utters it may be to blame for his lack of better knowledge. In order to be truthful it is necessary to make a sincere effort to know the truth, to see things clearly, to look at them from all sides, and to view them not partially but as a whole. The lack of intent to deceive or harm and the known purpose to entertain, instruct or amuse, frees works of fiction from the charge of being lies.

The decalogue forbids us to "bear false witness against our neighbor," and thus singles out for condemnation the worst form of lying, namely, that against persons. The damage done by slander and libel is incalculable, because its tendency is to undermine and destroy men's reputation. The seriousness of the offense is recognized by the law in making such offenses actionable. In its most serious form as false witness in court, falsehood is a menace to justice, and may result in the punishment of the innocent or the setting free of the guilty.

The demand for truthfulness includes, however, a far wider scope than merely the avoidance of false witness against our neighbor. It requires genuine sincerity in all our dealings with others, and the avoidance of all deception, misrepresentation, double-dealing, prevarication, dissimulation, flattery, hypocrisy and lying of any kind. The moral courage of our convictions, slowness in making promises and faithfulness in keeping them, readiness to apologize to those whom we have wronged and thus to vindicate the truth even at the cost of humiliation to ourselves, respecting the confidence which others have reposed in us, keeping our minds free from prejudice and thus enabling ourselves to be fair in our estimate of the virtues and faults of others—all this and much more belongs to that truthfulness and sincerity which should mark the Christian.

The so-called lie of necessity as a means of extricating ourselves from a predicament into which we have gotten by our own fault or otherwise, is not justifiable. This is to be distinguished, however, from withholding the truth from those who have no right to know it, or withholding it from certain persons for a season till they are in a better condition to bear it. Brutal frankness is no virtue. Sometimes the truth must be withheld in love. There is a time to speak and a time to keep silence (Eccl. 3:7). Love is the determining factor here as elswhere. The Christian is to speak the truth in love (Eph. 4:15).

The New Testament is strong in its emphasis upon truthfulness and its condemnation of lying. The lie of Ananias and Sapphira was punished with death (Acts 5). The apostle Paul urges the Ephesians to put away lying, and to speak the truth to one another, because they are members one of another (Eph. 4:25); and he exhorts the Colossians not to lie to one another, because as Christians they have put off the old man with his deeds (Col. 3:9). Both Paul and John class liars among the worst kind of offenders against the divine law (1 Tim. 1:10; Rev. 21:8, 27; 22:15).

The Sacredness of Human Life is guarded by the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." God, who gives human life, alone has the right to take it away. To kill a human being not only puts an untimely end to his career on earth, and deprives him of all opportunity to enjoy any other earthly good, but is an offense against the majesty of God Himself, because He made man in His own image (Gen. 9:6). Murder, abortion, suicide, duelling and wars are on the face of them in conflict with God's commandment. But other things than outright killing of others conflict with the divine command. Carelessness, neglect, persecution, slander, excessive and unjustifiable demands upon labor and strength, unkind or malicious treatment of others and similar things which tend to shorten human life are likewise a breaking of the divine law. Hatred is murder in the heart (1 John 3:15), and often leads to actual murder.

The causes of murder are numerous. Anger, envy, revenge, greed, drunkenness, jealousy, the endeavor to hide other crimes and similar causes lie back of the enormous number of murders which disgrace our American civilization. The explanation of this terrible disregard of the sacredness of human life must be found, however, not only in the causes enumerated, but in the psychological effect of the terrible slaughter of human lives in the World War, in the frequency with which murderers escape detection, and in the comparative ease with which many of them escape proper punishment when they have been apprehended. The remedy must lie not only in the infliction of certain, prompt and adequate punishment, but also in the endeavor through the religious and moral training of the young to counteract and overcome the causes which lead to murder.

The Christian, who interprets the divine commandments of the decalogue in the light of the law of love, recognizes that his duty is not simply that of refraining from physical violence against another person, but of doing what lies in his power to protect his neighbor from threatening dangers, and of assisting him in living out in health and happiness the period of life allotted to him.

Killing in self-defense, whether in the case of an individual whose life is unjustly attacked when no other mode of defense is available, or in the case of a nation which wages war in self-defense because it is forced to do so, is an exception to the law which must be recognized. But in both cases it is quite possible that a little more patience, a little more self-control, a little less passion and fear, a little less pride, and a little less haste might have made the so-called killing in self-defense unnecessary.

Suicide, which was regarded by the Stoics as not only justifiable, but under certain circumstances as necessary and noble, is utterly unchristian. It is an offense against man's own soul, against those who are dependent on him, and against God the giver of life. It is to be borne in mind, however, that in some cases suicide is the result of genuine mental derangement.

Friendship is based on mutual esteem, and requires a certain harmony of ideals and aspirations. It is marked by mutual love and sympathy. Though we are to have Christian love for all men, and should be on friendly terms with many acquaintances, we are likely to have comparatively few intimate friends. As a rule friendships are formed in youth; but many beautiful friendships have been established in later years. Those of later years are likely to be built upon a sounder basis. A true friend is an inestimable treasure. There are degrees of friendship, the rarest and most precious being that in which, like Jonathon and David, one loves the other as his own soul (1 Sam. 18:1). The twelve were not only Christ's disciples but His friends (John 15:15), and within this circle Peter and James and John were on terms of greater intimacy with Jesus than the others. Paul and Timothy were close friends. The Reformation shows us the beautiful friendship of Luther and Melanchthon.

Friendships should be treasured. A life without friends would be intolerable. But friendships require mutual fidelity. If we would keep our friends we must guard their friendship with care, and unfailingly show ourselves to be true friends to them. Because of the powerful influence which friends have upon our ideals and our conduct, they should be chosen with care. It is especially incumbent upon parents to exercise oversight over their children's choice of friends.

Recreation and Enjoyment. The ethical justification of recreation and amusement lies in the fact that the well-being of body and of mind demands them as a relaxation from labor and as a preparation for new endeavors. To this end leisure is necessary. For many centuries any but the scantiest amount of leisure was the possession of only a favored few. But with the shortening of the hours of labor in most occupations which has come in recent times leisure has become a possession of the many. The ethical use of leisure is considerable of a problem. Many persons seem hardly to know what to do with their leisure when they have it; and what should be hours or days of leisure and recreation become periods of mad running after entertainment and amusement of one kind or another. Hence there has been a tremendous growth of agencies which undertake to amuse and entertain men for money. It only too frequently happens that instead of returning to their daily work refreshed and strengthened, the manner in which men spend their leisure sends them back to their daily toil no more refreshed in body and mind and perhaps even more fatigued than when they left it the day before. As a people we have much to learn with regard to the right use of leisure.

Conversation is a restful, helpful and refreshing experience when engaged in with congenial minds among our friends and acquaintances. To a large extent conversation is a lost art, and its joys have been exchanged for those of the moving-picture, the radio, the card table and the dance. Its purpose is recreation, pleasure and the cultivation of the amenities of life. Each is to give as well as receive. None is to be a silent member of the group, and none is to monopolize the conversation. It is not necessary that the conversation shall always possess a religious character. But what the Christian says and does in society should always be in harmony with his character as a regenerate man. A sense of humor will do much to lighten life's burdens, relieve nervous tension, and brighten the social gathering. The lack of it is a distinct loss to a man. But care should be taken not to exceed the bounds of propriety, and not to permit jokes or sallies of wit which leave a wound or which contain an element of uncleanness or suggestiveness.

Games which involve physical or mental exercise or which simply provide relaxation and enjoyment are ethically justifiable and unobjectionable, so long as they are not employed for gambling and are not carried to excess so as to become a dissipation. Every form of recreation should do for us what the word recreation implies; it should recreate us for the better fulfillment of our daily round of duties. Amusements which decrease rather than increase our ability to work are to be shunned. Amusement should be a means to an end, and not an end in itself. After all we are not put into this world for the main purpose of having what worldly men call a good time.

Reading is one of the most satisfactory and easily available forms of relaxation and enjoyment. Of the publishing of many books and magazines and newspapers there is no end. Public libraries make the treasures and the trash of ancient and modern literature accessible to practically all our people. A distinction must be made, of course, between reading simply for relaxation and reading for mental improvement and growth. The freedom of the press makes possible the publication of all kinds of theories and ideas, many of them in utter conflict with Christian doctrine and with Christian ideals of morality. This makes it necessary for the Christian not only to read with a critical mind, so as to sift the wheat from the chaff, but to select for reading the books which will be helpful to him in building up his spiritual life and confirming his Christian ideals. He will need to read much that is antichristian if he would keep abreast of the thought of the day; but he will not find it necessary to saturate his mind with spiritual and mental poison; on the contrary, he will read that also which will prove to be the antidote to the poison.

It is regrettable that so much of the popular literature has become a prey to a crude realism which delights in depicting the sordid side of life, and particularly delights in portraying matters of sex with what is claimed to be frankness but with what in reality is often salaciousness. The Christian who cares for that purity of heart which the Lord enjoins (Matt. 5:8) will be careful in the choice of the books which he reads even for relaxation, and seek to choose such as will do no harm to his Christian life, but will aid him in building up Christian habits of thinking and acting. What we read becomes our mental pabulum, and helps to mold our character for better or for worse.

Dancing in its modern forms is at best a very questionable form of amusement. That it has been productive of many moral downfalls, especially in the case of dances conducted in public halls, is a recognized fact. Whether the intimate physical contact and the more or less suggestive movements of most modern dancing are an innocent form of amusement anywhere is at the least open to serious question. The Christian in this and all other matters must be honest with himself, and let his enlightened conscience be his guide. Modern dances can claim no kinship with the permitted dances mentioned in the Bible, which were dances of men by themselves and women by themselves.

The Theater, whether presenting moving-picture, drama, opera or vaudeville, is an ethical or unethical form of amusement according to the nature of its presentations. The present tendency of the theater to exploit the sexual, to be an exponent of the baldest realism, and to approach and even to pass beyond the utmost bounds of decency is to be unqualifiedly deplored. The Christian should not only remain away from such improper exhibitions, but should seek to mold public opinion so as to bring about the needed improvement in the character of that which the theater presents.

In all forms of recreation and amusement, the Christian's conduct should be regulated by his duty to avoid peril to his own soul, and to refrain as far as possible from giving offense to others.

Mankind and the Kingdom of God. The Christian's membership in the human race, on the one hand, and in the Kingdom of God, on the other, necessitates a careful adjustment of all his social relations to perfect harmony with his fellowship in the Kingdom of God. As an ethical being, with a psycho-physical nature and placed in the world and in certain relations in human society, he finds the sphere of his social ethical activities within those relations. He should, therefore, so order his conduct in all things that it may not only conform to the high standard of God's Kingdom, but that it may also constitute him in his place and sphere an effective instrument in the hands of the Holy Spirit for the regeneration of the individuals with whom he is associated and for the infusion of the spirit of Christ into all human relationships. Christians are the light of the world, the salt of the earth, and the leaven which leavens the lump. If the light fails to shine, the salt to season, and the leaven to do its work, how shall the world be enlightened and transformed, and permeated with the spirit of God's Kingdom?

The Christian should, therefore, in the family, the Church, the State and society in general so manifest the virtues of a genuine Christian character and so exhibit genuine Christian conduct, that he may faithfully do his part, however humble, to hasten the time when "at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth," and when "every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Works on Ethics

Hastings: Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. 12 vols. N. Y., Scribners, 1910-1922.
S. Mathews and G. B. Smith: A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics. N. Y., Macmillan, 1921.
Articles on Ethics and ethical subjects in Encyclopedia Brittanica and the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.
Luthardt: Geschichte der christlichen Ethik. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1888-1893. First volume trans. from the German by W. Hastie: History of Christian Ethics before the Reformation. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1889.
T. C. Hall: A History of Ethics within Organized Christianity. N. Y., Scribners, 1910.
Gass: Geschichte der christlichen Ethik. 2d ed. Berlin, 1889-1893.
Sidgwick: History of Ethics. 5th ed. N. Y., Macmillan, 1906.
Rogers: Morals in Review. N. Y., Macmillan, 1927.
Lecky. History of European Morals. 2 vols. London, 1869. N. Y., Appleton, 1878.
Sneath: The Evolution of Ethics as Revealed in the Great Religions. Yale University Press. 1927.

Ethics of Jesus and of the New Testament

H. Jacoby: Neutestamentliche Ethik. Koenigsberg, 1899.
Stalker: The Ethics of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels. Cincinnati, Jennings & Graham, 1909.
—— Imago Christi. N. Y., Doran, 1889.
Briggs: The Ethical Teachings of Jesus. N. Y., Scribners, 1904.
King: The Ethics of Jesus. N. Y., Macmillan, 1912.
E. F. Scott: The Ethical Teachings of Jesus. N. Y., Macmillan, 1924.

Protestant Ethics

Wuttke: Christian Ethics. 2 vols. Trans. from the German. N. Y., Nelson & Phillips, 1876.

Harless: System of Christian Ethics. Trans. from the German. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1868.

Martensen: Christian Ethics. 3 vols. Individual, Social and General Ethics. Vols. I and II trans. from the German ed. Vol. III trans. from the Danish. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1881-84.

Sartorius: The Doctrine of Divine Love. Trans. from the German. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1884.

Schmid: Christliche Sittenlehre. Gotha, 1861, 1867. Abridged by W. J. Mann: General Principles of Christian Ethics. Philadelphia, 1872.

Dorner: System of Christian Ethics. Trans. from the German. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark. N. Y., Scribners, 1887.

Gregory: Christian Ethics. Philadelphia, Eldredge & Brother, 1875.

Paulus: The Christian Life. Trans. from the German. Cincinnati, Cranston & Curts, 1892.

Haering: The Ethics of the Christian Life. Trans. from the German. London, 1907. N. Y., Putnam, 1909.

Davidson: Christian Ethics. Chicago, F. H. Revell. No date.

Knight: The Christian Ethics. London, 1893.

Strong: Christian Ethics. London, 1896.

Smyth: Christian Ethics. N. Y., Scribners, 1892.

Robins: The Ethics of the Christian Life. Philadelphia, Griffith & Roland Press, 1904.

Clark: The Christian Method of Ethics. N. Y., F. H. Revell, 1908.

Alexander: Ethics and Christianity. N. Y., Scribners, 1914.

Bruce: The Formation of Christian Character. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1908.

Murray: A Handbook of Christian Ethics. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1908.

Keyser: A System of Christian Ethics. Philadelphia, The Lutheran Pub. Society, 1913.

Haas: Freedom and Christian Conduct. N. Y., Macmillan, 1923.

G. B. Smith: The Principles of Christian Living. A Handbook of Christian Ethics. University of Chicago Press, 1924.

Schleiermacher: Die christliche Sittenlehre. Herausgegeben von L. Jonas. Berlin, 1843, 1884.
Rothe: Theologische Ethik. Wittenberg, 1870.
Koestlin: Christliche Ethik. Berlin, 1899.
Palmer: Moral des Christentums. Stuttgart, 1864.
Beck: Vorlesungen über christliche Ethik. 2 vols., 1882.
Kaehler: Theologische Ethik. In "Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre," Leipzig, 1905.
Kuebel: Christliche Ethik. Munich, 1896.
Vilmar: Theologische Moral. Gütersloh, 1871.
v. Hofmann: Theologische Ethik. Nördlingen, 1878.
Frank: System der christlichen Sittlichkeit. Erlangen, 1884.
Luthardt: Die Ethik Luthers. Leipzig, 1867.
—— Kompendium der theologischen Ethik. 2d ed., 1898.
Herrmann: Ethik. Tübingen, 1901.
Lange: Christliche Ethik. Heidelberg, 1878.
Heppe: Christliche Ethik. Leipzig, 1901.
Weiss: Die christliche Idee des Guten. Gotha, 1877.
Krarup: Grundriss der christlichen Ethik. Trans. into German by Kuechler. Freiberg, 1897.
Deinzer: Christliche Ethik. Neuendettelsau, 1904.
Seeberg: System der Ethik im Grundriss. Leipzig, 1911.
Kirn: Grundriss der theologischen Ethik. Leipzig, 1912.
Reu: Christliche Ethik. Dubuque, Ia., 1914.

Roman Catholic Ethics

Rickaby: Moral Philosophy. N. Y., Longmans, 1888.
The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII. N. Y., Benziger, 1903.
Liguori: Theologia Moralis. 1756 and often.
Pascal: Provincial Letters (in Temple Classics). London, 1904.
Mausbach: Die katholische Moral, ihre Methoden, Grundsaetzen und Aufgaben. Cologne, 1901.
Herrman: Faith and Morals. N. Y., Putnam, 1904.

Philosophical Ethics

General Survey

Palmer: The Field of Ethics. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1901.
Schuyler: Systems of Ethics. N. Y., Eaton & Mains, 1902.

Seth: Ethical Principles. 13 ed. N. Y., Scribners, 1916.
Hyde: The Five Great Philosophies of Life. N. Y., Macmillan, 1917.

Ethics of the Greeks and Romans

Zeller: Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy. N. Y., Holt, 1890.
—— The Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics. N. Y., Longmans, 1870.
Plato: Dialogues.
Aristotle: Nichomachean Ethics.
Epictetus: Discourses.
Marcus Aurelius: Meditations.

Intuitional Ethics

Fowler: Shaftesbury and Hutchinson. 1883.
Adam Smith: Theory of the Moral Sentiments. 1759 and often.
Butler: Sermons upon Human Nature and Dissertation on Virtue. 1729. Works, Oxford. 1844.
Whewell: Elements of Morality. 2 vols. N. Y., Harpers, 1848. 1863.
Dugald Stewart: Outlines of Moral Philosophy. 1783, 1869.
Calderwood: Handbook of Moral Philosophy. N. Y., Macmillan, 1872, 1888 and often.
Laurie: Ethica, or The Ethics of Reason, 1885.
Martineau: Types of Ethical Theory. 2 vols. 2d ed. N. Y., Macmillan, 1886.
Porter: Elements of Moral Science. N. Y., Scribners, 1885.

Hedonistic and Utilitarian Ethics

Hobbes: Leviathan. 1651 and often.
Mandeville: The Fable of the Bees. 1714.
Locke: Essay concerning the Human Understanding. Bk. I, Chs. 3, 4; Bk. II, Ch. 21. Many editions.
Hume: Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals. 1751. Works edited by Green and Grove. 4 vols. 1882. Everyman's Library, 2 vols. 1911.
Mill, J. S.: Utilitarianism. 1863. Everyman's Library. 1910.
Bentham: Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. 1789 and since.

Paley: Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. 1785 and often.
Watson: Hedonistic Theories from Aristippus to Spencer. N. Y., Macmillan, 1895.
Birks: Modern Utilitarianism, or The Systems of Paley, Bentham and Mill Examined and Compared. N. Y., Macmillan, 1874.
Bain: Moral Science. A Compendium of Ethics. 1869.
Sidgwick: Method of Ethics. 7th ed. Macmillan, 1907.
Rashdall: The Theory of Good and Evil. (A modified utilitarianism.) Oxford, 1907.
Sharp: Ethics. N. Y., Century, 1928.
Drake: Problems of Conduct. N. Y., Houghton Mifflin, 1914.
—— The New Morality. N. Y., Macmillan, 1928.

Evolutionary Ethics

Spencer: Data of Ethics. 1878.
Stephen: Science of Ethics. 1882.
Alexander, S.: Moral Order and Progress. 1889.
Schurman: The Ethical Import of Darwinism. 1888.
Clifford: Lectures and Essays. 1879, 1886.
Huxley: Evolution and Ethics. 1894.
Hobhouse: Morals in Evolution. 2 vols. 1900.
Westermarck: Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas, 1909.

Idealistic Ethics

Kant: Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Ethics. Trans. by Abbott. 5th ed. N. Y., Longmans, 1916.
—— Critique of the Practical Reason. 1788.
Caird: The Critical Philosophy of Kant. 1890.
Green: Prolegomena to Ethics. 1883, 1887.
Bowne: Principles of Ethics. 1906.
Bradley: Ethical Studies. 1876.
Sorley: The Moral Life. 1912.
Mackenzie: Manual of Ethics. 4th ed. 1900.
Muirhead: Elements of Ethics. 1892.
D'Arcy: A Short Study of Ethics. 2d ed. 1901.
Taylor: Problem of Conduct. 1901.
Ward: The Realm of Ends. 1910.

Moore: Principia Ethica. 1903.
Royce: Religious Aspects of Philosophy. 1887.
—— The Philosophy of Loyalty. 1908.
Wright: Self-realization. 1913.

German Philosophical Ethics

Lotze: Practical Philosophy. 1890.
Hegel: Philosophy of Right. 1896.
Paulsen: System of Ethics. 1899.
Wundt: Ethics. 3 vols. 1892.

(On most of the following subjects consult also the literature mentioned above.)

Personality and Free Will

B. P. Bowne: Personalism. N. Y., Houghton, Mifflin, 1908.
A. C. Knudson: The Philosophy of Personalism. 1927.
J. B. Jevons: Personality. N. Y., Putnam, 1913.
C. C. J. Webb: God and Personality. N. Y., Macmillan, 1919, 1920.
J. W. Buckham: Personality and Psychology. N. Y., Doran, 1924.
C. A. Strong: Why the Mind Has a Body. N. Y., Macmillan, 1903.
W. H. Thomson: Brain and Personality. N. Y., Dodd, Mead, 1912.
G. T. Ladd: The Secret of Personality. N. Y., Longmans, 1918.
M. Hopkins: The Scriptural Idea of Man. N. Y., Scribners, 1883.
J. T. Beck: Outlines of Biblical Psychology. Trans. from the German. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1877.
F. Delitzsch: System der biblischen Psychologie. Leipzig, 1861.
H. H. Horne: Free Will and Human Responsibility. N. Y., Macmillan, 1912.
W. James: The Will to Believe (The Dilemma of Determinism), N. Y., Longmans, 1897 and often.
C. E. Luthardt: Die Lehre von dem freien Willen in seinem Verhältniss zur Gnade in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung dargestellt. Leipzig. 1863.

H. Alexander: Theories of the Will in the History of Philosophy. N. Y., 1898.
J. Edwards: A Careful and Strict Enquiry into the Modern and Prevailing Notions of the Freedom of the Will. Boston, 1754. London, 1856.
J. E. Stewart: Freedom of the Will Vindicated, or Pres. Edwards' Necessitarian Theory Refuted. Glasgow, 1876.
D. D. Whedon: The Freedom of the Will. N. Y., Phillips & Hunt, 1864.
R. G. Hazard: Freedom of Mind in Willing. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1889.
J. L. Girardeau: The Will in its Theological Relations. N. Y., Baker & Taylor Co., 1891.

Sin and The Law

J. Müller: The Christian Doctrine of Sin. 2 vols. Trans. from the German. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1877.
J. Tulloch: The Christian Doctrine of Sin. N. Y., Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 1876.
J. Orr: God's Image in Man and Its Defacement. N. Y., Armstrong, 1906.
R. Mackintosh: Christianity and Sin. N. Y., Scribners, 1914.
C. F. W. Walther: The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel. Trans. from the German by W. H. T. Dau. St. Louis, Concordia Pub. House, 1929.
Canon Streeter: Moral Adventure (maintains the reasonableness of the Christian moral code). N. Y., Macmillan, 1928.
W. Lippmann: A Preface to Morals (Rejects authoritative morality). N. Y., Macmillan, 1929.
L. T. Hobhouse: The Rational Good. N. Y., Holt, 1921.
G. H. Palmer. The Nature of Goodness. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1902.

Regeneration and the Regenerate Man

H. Schmid: The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church Exhibited and Verified from the Original Sources. Trans. from the German by Hay and Jacobs. Philadelphia 1876, pp. 474ff.
A. Kuyper: The Work of the Holy Spirit. Trans. from the Dutch by H. de Vries. N. Y., Funk and Wagnalls, 1900.

J. N. Kildahl: Misconceptions of the Word and Work of the Holy Spirit. Trans. from the Norwegian by A. S. Boe. Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House. 1927.

Jesuits and Jesuitic Morality

H. Boehmer: The Jesuits. A Historical Study. Trans. from the German by P. Z. Strodach. Philadelphia, The Castle Press, 1928.

T. Slater: A Manual of Moral Theology for English Speaking Countries. N. Y., Benziger, 1908.

—— Short History of Moral Theology. N. Y., Benziger, 1909.

Legalism

W. Walther: Lehrbuch der Symbolik. Leipzig, 1924. Pp. 142ff., Die guten Werke der römischen Sittlichkeit. Pp. 252ff., Die Quelle, das Prinzip, das Ziel und die eigentümliche Askese der reformirten Sittlichkeit.

M. Luther: The Freedom of the Christian Man. In Wace and Buchheim: Luther's Primary Works. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1896.

Mysticism

Horton: The Mystical Quest of Christ. N. Y., Doran, 1924.

The Social Order

W. Rauschenbusch: Christianity and the Social Crisis. N. Y., Macmillan, 1907.

—— Christianizing the Social Order. N. Y., Macmillan, 1912.

H. A. Mess: Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society. N. Y., Doran, 1923.

S. Mathews: Jesus on Social Institutions. N. Y., Macmillan, 1929.

L. L. Bernard: An Introduction to Social Psychology. N. Y., Holt, 1926.

C. A. Ellwood: The Psychology of Human Society. N. Y., Appleton, 1925.

P. Sorokin: Contemporary Sociological Theories. N. Y., Harpers, 1928.

H. W. Zorbaugh: Gold Coast and Slum. University of Chicago Press, 1929.

The Family

E. Westermarck: The History of Human Marriage. 3 vols. 5th ed. N. Y., Macmillan, 1921, 1925.
W. Goodsell: The History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution. N. Y., Macmillan, 1915.
—— Problems of the Family. N. Y., Century, 1928.
H. Bosanquet: The Family. N. Y., Macmillan, 1906. 2d ed., 1915.
G. W. Fiske: The Changing Family. N. Y., Harpers, 1928.
A. H. Gray: Men, Women and God. N. Y., Doran, 1922.
M. A. Bigelow: Sex Education. N. Y., Macmillan, 1916.
M. Royden: Sex and Common Sense. N. Y., Putnam, 1922.
S. Eddy: Sex and Youth. Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, Doran, 1929.
C. W. Margold: Sex Freedom and Social Control. University of Chicago Press, 1926.
J. Addams: A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil. N. Y., Macmillan, 1911.
Sir J. Marchant: Medical Views on Birth Control. London, Hutchinson, 1926.
A. M. Carr-Saunders: The Population Problem. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922.
H. D. Chapin: Heredity and Child Culture. N. Y., Dutton, 1928.
H. F. Cope: Religious Education in the Family. University of Chicago Press, 1925.
L. A. Weigle: Training of Children in the Christian Family. Pilgrim Press, 1921.
F. Adler: Marriage and Divorce. N. Y., Doubleday Page, 1905.
W. Gwynne: Divorce in America under State and Church, N. Y., Macmillan, 1925.

The Church

J. G. Machen: Christianity and Liberalism. N. Y., Macmillan, 1923.
J. A. Faulkner: Modernism and the Christian Faith. N. Y., Methodist Book Concern, 1921.
J. Horsch: Modern Religious Liberalism; The Destructiveness

and Irrationality of the New Theology. Scottdale, Pa., Fundamental Truth Depot, 1921.
A. S. Zerbe: Christianity and False Evolutionism. Cleveland, O., Central Publishing House, 1925.
J. Orr: Revelation and Inspiration. N. Y., Scribners, 1910.
—— The Bible under Trial. London, Edinburgh, New York, Marshall Brothers Limited. No date.
M. Reu: Catechetics; or The Theory and Practice of Religious Instruction. Chicago, The Wartburg Publishing House, 1918, 1928.
T. G. Soares: Religious Education. University of Chicago Press, 1928.
G. A. Coe: What is Christian Education. N. Y., Scribners, 1929.
A. J. Brown: The Foreign Missionary. Chicago, F. H. Revell, 1907.
F. J. McConnell: Human Needs and World Christianity. N. Y., Friendship Press, 1929.
M. T. Price: Christian Missions and Oriental Civilizations. 1924.
A. Schweitzer: Christianity and the Religions of the World. N. Y., Doran, 1923.
F. J. McConnell: Church Finance and Social Ethics. N. Y., Macmillan, 1920.
F. A. Agar: The Stewardship of Life, N. Y., F. H. Revell, 1920.
W. H. Greever: Workers with God. Phila., United Lutheran Publication House, 1921.
L. E. Lovejoy: Stewardship of All Life. N. Y., Methodist Book Concern, 1924.
D. McConaughy: Money the Acid Test. Phila., The Westminster Press, 1919.

The State

J. H. Bluntschli: The Theory of the Modern State. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1895.
N. Wilde: The Ethical Basis of the State. Princeton University Press, 1924.
B. Bosanquet: The Philosophical Theory of the State. London, Macmillan, 1899.
L. T. Hobhouse: The Metaphysical Theory of the State. N. Y., Macmillan, 1918.
R. M. MacIver: The Modern State. N. Y., Oxford University Press, 1926.

Woodrow Wilson: The State. Boston, Heath & Co., 1898, rev. edition, 1911.
W. Cunningham: Christianity and Politics. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1917.
S. P. Cadman: Christianity and the State. N. Y., Macmillan, 1924.
S. L. Gulick: The Christian Crusade for a Warless World, 1922.
F. Palmer: The Folly of Nations. N. Y., Dodd, Mead, 1921.
W. Irwin: Christ of Mars. N. Y., Appleton, 1923.
J. Bryce: International Relations. N. Y., Macmillan, 1922.
R. E. Speer: The Christian Man, the Church and the War. Macmillan, 1918.
J. T. Shotwell: War as an Instrument of National Policy and its Renunciation in the Pact of Paris. N. Y., Harcourt, Brace, 1929.
Present Day Causes of International Friction and Their Elimination. The Annals of the Amer. Academy of Polit. and Soc. Science. July, 1929.
F. Boeckel: Between War and Peace. N. Y., Macmillan, 1928.
G. S. Dow: Crime and Its Prevention. Ann Arbor, Mich., Edwards, 1927.
Modern Crime: Its Prevention and Punishment. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. May, 1926.
The Police and the Crime Problem. The annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November, 1929.
Propagating Crime through the Jail and Other Institutions for Short Term Offenders. N. Y., The National Crime Commission, 1928.
A. J. Harno and Others: Parole and the Indeterminate Sentence. State of Illinois, 1928.

Society in General

J. Bryce: The Relation of the Advanced and Backward Races of Mankind. Oxford University Press, 1902.
J. H. Oldham: Christianity and the Race Problem. N. Y., Doran, 1924.
L. Stoddard: The Rising Tide of Color against White Supremacy. N. Y., Scribners, 1920.
F. Hertz: Race and Civilization. Trans. from the German. N. Y., Macmillan, 1928.

E. B. Reuter: The American Race Problem. N. Y., T. Y. Crowell, 1927.
S. Graham: The Soul of John Brown. N. Y., Macmillan, 1920.
R. H. Tawney: The Acquisitive Society. N. Y., Harcourt, Brace, 1920.
H. S. Coffin: A More Christian Industrial Order. Macmillan, 1920.
F. E. Johnson and A. E. Holt: Christian Ideals in Industry. N. Y., Methodist Book Concern, 1924.
H. Withers: The Case for Capitalism. London, Nash & Grayson, 1920.
G. D. H. Cole: Labor in the Commonwealth (the case against capitalism). N. Y., Huebsch, 1919.
J. Calder: Capital's Duty to the Wage-earner. N. Y., Longmans, 1923.
R. M. MacIver: Labor in the Changing World. N. Y., Dutton, 1919.
J. N. Ward: The Labor Movement in the United States, 1860-1895, N. Y., Appleton, 1929.
P. Vollmer: New Testament Sociology. N. Y., F. H. Revell, 1923.
E. E. Fischer: Social Problems; The Christian Solution. Phila., United Lutheran Publication House, 1927.

INDEX

A

Accountability, 7, 35.
Active principle, of the new life, 116.
Adiaphora, 175, 177, 235-236.
Adultery, a ground for divorce, 218.
Affection, family, 229.
Afflictions, 200-204.
Agricola, 93.
Alexander, S., 22.
Altruist, altruism, 5, 8, 23, 155.
Amusements, 179, 285-288.
Anarchy, 257.
Antinomianism, 91.
Aristotle, 2, 5, 9, 18, 210.
Asceticism, 8, 23, 205-206.

B

Ballot, 269.
Baptism, 121; regeneration and, 115.
Bentham, 23.
Body, the, 30; care for, 191.
Books. See Reading.
Bureaucracy, 260.

C

Calling. See Vocation.
Calvin, 15.
Capitalistic organizations, 276.
Catechism, Heidelberg, 143.
——, Luther's, 143, 181, 240, 253.
Catechetical instruction, 240.
Celibacy, not the ideal state, 211.
Change of mind, a, 100.
Character, 2.
Chastening, 201.
Chastity, 160.
Children, parental care of, 227; duty of, 228.
Christ, nature and purpose of his redemption, 54, 55, 97; His righteousness imputed, 55, 97; is the Mediator, 96, 99; the Savior, 109, 110; imitation of, 120.
Christian, a, needed, 29; what constitutes a, 94; as an ethical man, 108-123.
Church, the, 231-256; nature, of 232; is one, 233; on earth, 233; norm of, 233; teaching of, 235; confessions of, 236; task of, 237; public service of, 238; education by, 239; missions of, 242; empirical, 243; ministry of, 244; and State, 242, 265.
——, the ancient, 10, 134.
——, the Lutheran, 11, 13, 14, 93, 235.
——, the Reformed, 13, 14, 235.
——, the Roman Catholic, 7, 11, 13, 14, 49, 93, 134, 176, 184, 206, 211, 218, 232, 265.
Church member, the, 246, 248ff.
Citizen, the Christian, 267-269.
Clark, S., 24.
Commandments, the Ten, 61, 87, 88, 240; the Great or Double, 61, 87, 88, 155.
Communism, 259.
Companionate marriage, 222.
Conduct, 2, 25; principles and norm of, 169-174; norm of, 169; motive of, 170; nature of Christian, 175-181; true ideal of, 180; Christian, 249.
Confessions, the, nature of, 236; necessity of, 236; objections to, 236.
Conflict, inner, 77, 114; of duties, 172.
Conscience, 1, 6, 62-84; definition of, 62; basis of, in personality, 63; nature of its activity, 64; inade-

quacy of the term, 65; divine and human, 65; normative function of, 66; not infallible, 69; correct decisions by, 70; never to be disobeyed, 71; imperative function of, 72; presupposes the normative, 73; doubtful cases of, 74; forensic function of, 75; severity of self-judgment, 75; discord in, 76; differences in, 78; kinds of, 80; the regenerate, 82; own to be obeyed, 179.
Conscientiousness, 272.
Constitution, man's natural, 29-31.
Contradiction, the moral, in man, 9, 41, 95.
Conversation, 286.
Conversion, 41, 103.
Courage, 16, 17, 153.
Courtesy, 160.
Covetousness, 280.
Creed, 240. See Confessions.
Criminal, 262.
Cross, the Christian's, 199-204.
Cumberland, 23.
Cynics, 23.
Cyrenaics, 19, 22.

D

Dancing, 288.
Deacons and deaconesses, 245.
Decalogue, 8. See Commandments.
Desertion, malicious, 219.
Determinism, 33, 34.
Devil, the, tempts, 198.
Discipline, Church, 244.
Disinterestedness, of Christian love, 138.
Divorce, 218-221; permissible grounds for, 218, 219; laxity of laws on, 220, 221; increase of, 220; danger from, 220; unscriptural, 221.
Doctrine, purity of, 234, 237.
Dogmatics, and ethics, 11-13.
Dorner, 25, 57.
Duties, kinds of, 171; conflict of, 172; of our station, 180; to God, 182-189; to ourselves, 190-208; to our fellow men, 209-289.
Duty, determination of, 66-69, 121; difficult decisions of, 70; doubt as to, 74; and the law, 170; an obligation to God, 171.

E

Economics, 258.
Education, religious, 239-242; the Church's duty of, 239; methods of, 240; needed by the State, 242, 266.
Employee, 272, 276.
Employer, 272, 276.
Enjoyment, 179, 285.
Environment, 38.
Epicurean, epicureanism, 5, 19, 21, 22.
Ethical man, an, needed, 29, 94; the Christian, 108-123.
Ethics, definition and aim of, 1; name, 2; includes character and conduct, 2; general and Christian, 8.
——, Christian, and dogmatics, 11; confessional character of, 13; importance of, 15; definition and contents of, 25.
——, Greek, 15ff.
——, philosophical, 8, 21ff.
Eudæmonism, 24.
Evangelical counsels, 113, 169, 176.
Evangelization, of the world, 237.
Evolution, 44.
Expediency, Christian, 178.

F

Faith, 3; needed, 54; result of, 56; Roman Catholic conception of, 7, 13, 93; definition and nature of, 7, 57, 104, 109, 110, 111; place of, in the new life, 109; receptive and operative, 110; the mark of a Christian, 109; the mother of virtues, 135; works through love, 135; obtains full forgiveness, 201; makes a member of the Church, 232.
Fall, the, Biblical account of, 42; consequences of, 3, 45.
Family, the, 209-230; primitive form

of society, 209; its necessity and value, 209.
Fatalism, 33.
Fear, 137.
Fellow men, love to, 155-161; duties to, 209-289; all included in duty, 270.
Fellowship, with God, 5, 6, 41, 53, 56, 96, 100, 108, 127, 137; preservation of, 152, 190, 231.
Fidelity, 146.
Flesh, the, tempts, 197; the law in, 131.
Forensic function, of conscience, 75.
Forgiveness, of others, 157.
Francke, 93.
Frank, 25.
Free will, and morality, 4.
Freedom, Christian, 163; the new law of, 118; and expediency, 178.
Freedom of will, 11, 34, 46; formal and material, 35, 52; and responsibility, 36; true, 53, 108.
Friendship, 19, 157, 284.

G

Games, 286.
Giving, proper, 251, 279.
Gloom, Christianity not a religion of, 164.
Goal, of ethics, 16, 18, 21, 22, 127; the Christian, 25, 127.
God, fellowship with, 5, 6, 41, 53, 56, 96, 100, 152; relation to, is fundamental to ethics, 5, 6; man accountable to, 7; will of, 25, 58, 59, 87, 88, 127, 169, 170.
Golden Rule, 155, 159, 276.
Good, the highest, 127, 190.
Good man, the, produced by regeneration, 3.
Good will, 157.
Good works, the place of, 111; the fruits of faith, 111, 177; the motive of, 112, 176; cannot save, 112; a tribute of love, 112; not perfect, 112, 175; definition of, 113, Roman Catholic view of, 113, value of, 175.
Government, of the Church, 243.
Grace, means of, and ethical development, 121; 246.
Green, 24.
Growth, spiritual, 130.
Guilt, 51.

H

Haering, 25.
Harless, 25.
Hatred, 283.
Health, observance of laws of, 191.
Hedonism, 22, 24.
Hegel, 24.
Heredity, 38.
Highest good, the, 127, 190.
Hobbes, 23.
Holy Spirit, produces regeneration, 29; brings sinner to repentance and faith, 57, 98, 104, 115; applies redemption, 94; the sin against, 50; and baptism, 115.
Home, the, 229.
Honesty, 279.
Hope, 134, 149.
Huguenots, 232.
Humanitarianism, 8.
Hume, 24.
Humility, toward God, 140; toward men, 159.
Husband, duties of, 224.

I

Ideal, the moral, 1, 4, 17, 41, 53, 57, 128, 180.
Idleness, 271.
Image of God, the metaphysical, 31; the moral, 41, 45.
Imitation of Christ, 120, 121.
Imperative function, of conscience, 72.
Inability, the moral, of the natural man, 3, 52, 94.
Indeterminism, 34.
Individuality, 37.
International relations, 263.
Introspection, 208.
Intuitionism, 23, 24.

J

Josephus, 140.
Joy, 148.

Justice, 16, 17, 18, 158, 258, 260, 269.
Justification, 55, 97, 110.

K

Kant, 23, 95.
Keyser, 25.
Kindness, 159.
Kingdom of God, 57, 100, 142, 211, 289.
Koestlin, 25.

L

Labor organizations, 276.
Law, the moral, 58ff.; its nature, 58; why good, 59; in conscience, 60, 68; external divine, 60; where found, 87, 120; unity of, 88; the regenerate man and, 117; as a guide, 119; is perfect, 169; and duty, 170.
——, human, 85.
——, the ceremonial, 59, 87.
——, threefold use of, 89.
——, the new, of freedom, 118.
Laws, of the State, 85, 260; need the support of a majority, 261; not good because well-intentioned, 261; sumptuary, 261; do not produce genuine morality, 261; purpose and value of, 261.
Layman, the, 248.
Legalism, legalistic, 14, 254.
Legalist, 2, 46.
Liberality, 18.
Liberty, 258, 260, 269; of conscience, 266; Christian, 178.
Lie, the, 281, 282.
Life, the Christian, the nature of, 127-136; differs from others, 128; motive of, 129; inevitableness of, 129; the result of the new spiritual life, 130; growth of, 130.
——, human, sacred, 283.
Longsuffering, 159.
Lord's Prayer, 48, 185, 240.
Lord's Supper, 123, 239.
Love, God's, of pity and of complacency, 97; produces love in us, 117.
Love, the Christian's, is his motive, 132; results from God's, 132; growth of, 133; as a virtue, 134ff.; to God, 137-150; the fundamental virtue, 137; a unifying principle, 137; produced by contemplation of God's love, 138; not produced by a command, 139; virtues comprehended in, 139; to ourselves, 151ff.; to our fellow men, 155ff.; its scope, 156; its nature, 157; brotherly, 159; to the world in general, 162ff.
Loyalty to Christ and the Church, 248.
Luthardt, 26.
Luther, 26, 93, 111, 164, 180, 181, 253.

M

Magnanimity, 18, 140.
Man as a moral being, 29-40; his natural moral state, 41-57.
Mankind, duties, to, 270; and the Kingdom of God, 289.
Marriage, the normal state, 211; monogamous, 212; Christian ideal of, 212; purpose of, 213; care in entering upon, 214-216; by the Church, 217; for life, 217; second, 217; and a career, 226.
Martensen, 25.
Martyrdom, 165, 204.
Materialism, 192.
Mediatorial work, of Christ, 96, 99.
Meditation, Christian, 207.
Meliorism, 166.
Metanoia, 41, 56, 100.
Mind, education of the, 192; a Christlike, 133.
Ministry, the, 244, 247.
Missions, 242.
Moderation, 18.
Modernism, 95.
Monogamy, 212.
Moral being, a, man as, 29-40.
Moral state, man's natural, 41-57.
Motive, 33, 34; the Christian, 25, 112, 124ff.
Murder, 283.
Mysticism, 8.

N

Nationality, 38.
Natural, the, not in itself sinful, 162.
Naturalism, 34.
Necessity, 4, 33.
New man. See Regenerate man.
Nomism, 91.
Norm, the moral, 1, 25, 87; the Christian, 169.
Normative function, of conscience, 66.

O

Oath, the, 186.
Obedience, 144.
Occupation, choice of, 273.
Optimism, 165.
Original sin, 45; consequences of, 3, 45.

P

Palatinate, 232.
Pantheism, 44.
Parents, duties of, 226.
Pastor, the, 247.
Patriotism, 268; false, 265.
Pelagianism, 34.
Perjury, 186.
Persecution, 204.
Personality, and morality, 3; nature of, 3, 31, 33; a Christian, necessary, 29, 94; God respects man's, 104.
Persuasion, 104, 105.
Pessimism, 165.
Pietism, 93, 179.
Plato, 16, 44, 127, 210.
Pleasure, 19, 22.
Polygamy, 212.
Poverty, 277.
Prayer, 182-186; nature and necessity of, 182f.; essential factor in, 183; not meritorious, 184; practical aspects of, 185; the Lord's, 185; the answer to, 186.
Predestination, 34.
Probabilism, 173.
Property, 273; problems of, 275; right use of, 278.
Prostitution, 222.
Public service, the, 238.
Punishment, 261.
Puritanism, Puritans, 179, 232.

R

Race, 38; duties to the, 270.
Reading, 287.
Realism, in literature, 287.
Reconciliation, with God, 96.
Recreation, 191, 285.
Redemption, 3; necessity of, 53; nature and purpose of, 3, 54ff.
Regenerate man, the, 10; the acting subject of Christian ethics, 25, 84, 94, 108; faith the mark of, 109, 111; becomes sanctified, 114; and the law, 117.
Regeneration, necessity of, 3, 11, 41, 46, 94, 95; effects of, 83; nature of, 102, 109; relation to sanctification, 106; and baptism, 115.
Religion, and morality, 5; furnishes basis for morality, 6.
Repentance, 98, 100.
Riches, 277.
Rights, natural, 258, 260.

S

Sabbath, Sunday not the, 253.
Sacraments, 122, 233, 244.
Salvation, nature of, 54ff.
Salzburgers, 232.
Sanctification, and regeneration, 106; nature of, 113; its place in the new life, 113; progress in, 115; means of, 122.
Sartorius, 13.
Schiller, 95.
Schmid, 25.
Scriptures, the Holy, normative for the Church, 233; the inspired record of revelation, 234; faithfulness to teachings of, 234-235.
Scrupulousness, 80.
Self, duties to, 190-209.
Self-consciousness, 3, 32, 64.
Self-defense, of individual, 284; of the State, 264, 284.

Self-denial, 107, 193-196.
Self-determination, 4, 32, 64.
Self-development, 204.
Self-preservation, spiritual, 190.
Service, the public, 238; attendance at, 248.
Seth, 21.
Sex, 39; abuse of, 221; peril in sins of, 222; causes of abuses of, 223; the remedy, 223.
Sidgwick, 22, 23.
Sin, origin of, 42; nature of, 43; definition of, 44; original, 45; consequences of, 45, 51; actual, 46; kinds of, 47; against the Holy Ghost, 50; all alike in essence, 50; degrees of guilt, 51.
Sincerity, 161, 282.
Slander, 281.
Socialism, 259, 276, 277.
Society, duties to, 270-289.
Socrates, 16, 44.
Soul, 30; care for as mind, 192; care for as spirit, 193.
Sovereignty, of the State, 263; relation of, to others, 264.
Spencer, 22.
Spener, 93, 179.
State, the, 5, 17, 19, 221, 257-269; necessity of, 257; purpose of, 257; activities of, 259; maintains justice and order, 260; laws of, 260; punishment by, 261; reclaiming the criminal, 262; sovereignty of, 263; international relations of, 263; war by, 264; the Christian, 265; and religion, 266; citizens of, 267; offices in, 268.
Stephen, 22.
Stewardship, 250.
Stoics, Stoicism, 2, 5, 20, 23, 156, 270.
Sufferings, 200-204.
Suicide, 21, 283, 284.
Sunday, 252-256; not the Sabbath, 253; proper observance of, 253; laws, 255.
Sunday school, 241.
Supererogation, works of, 113; are impossible, 176.

T

Task, the Christian's, 119; the Church's, 237.
Taxes, 268.
Temperament, 39.
Temperance, 16, 17, 154, 191.
Temptation, 196-199.
Thankfulness, 142.
Theater, 288.
Tithing, 251, 279.
Transformation, the inner, 56, 57, 94-107; needed, 54, 94, 95; nature of, 99; is ethical, 104.
Trust, 147.
Truthfulness, 161, 281.

U

Unselfishness, 160.
Utilitarian, Utilitarianism, 5, 22.

V

Vigilance, 153.
Vilmar, 25.
Virtue, its nature, 134; a unit, 134; and duty, 182.
Virtues, Socrates', 16; Plato's, 16; Aristotle's, 18; Epicurean, 20; Stoic, 20; Christian, 140ff., 152ff., 158ff.
Vital principle, of the new life, 110, 116.
Vocation, the, 179.
Vow, the, 187.

W

War, 264; the World, 283.
Wealth, 277.
Wife, duties of, 224.
Wisdom, 16, 17, 152.
Word of God, the, power of, 105, 238; regeneration through, 115, 122; duty of preaching, 238; holds central place in the service, 239.
Work, 271ff.
World, the, in general, love to, 162-166; the Christian in but not of, 163; tempts, 197.
Wuttke, 25.

Date Due

O 30 '46

FACULTY

NO 25 '49

NOV 2 6 '56

DEC 1 0 '56

FACULTY

~~MAY 2 7 '60~~

~~MAY 2 1 '70~~

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01002 0388